

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1835.

---

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ART. I.—*Sermons.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., *Head Master of Rugby School, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.* Vol. III. London: Fellowes. 1834.

OUR readers need no introduction to Dr. Arnold, whose works we have already, as opportunity allowed, submitted to their notice.\* The style of the *Sermons* under review resembles that of its predecessors, being every where characterised by simplicity of language, general purity of doctrine, the most persuasive affectionateness of heart, and that genuine *naturalness* of manner, which has been well described, by a learned ornament of our Church, as equally remote from “a cold, constrained, authoritative form and language, on the one hand, and from exaggerated statements and unwarranted excitements, by travelling beyond the record, on the other.”† These *Sermons* were mostly preached before a peculiar congregation, in Rugby School Chapel; yet they will be found to relate to many questions of universal interest, and to contain views not adapted, in many instances, to one age more than to another. There is much in the volume before us that is quite original. There is much, we are bound to add, if not in the *Sermons*, yet in the *Appendices*, that is false, and mischievous, and latitudinarian, even to laxness!

We seldom indulge in metaphysical lucubrations, or we might be tempted to descant, in reviewing the work before us, upon the mental constitution, or the frame, or the bias, or whatever it be, of the intel-

---

\* See CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER for September, 1829, and March, 1833.

† See Miller's admirable *Sermons*. Preface, p. xxxi.

lectual faculties, by which theological and political liberalism so frequently unite together. Whether this alliance proceed from pride of heart, disdainful of all controlling powers; or haughtiness of temper, fretting under the yoke of authority, however easy; or whether ambition, loving to rule rather than obey, be the source of this union; or whether it be referable to a lust of paradox, and a love of notoriety,—we will not arrogate the privilege of deciding, but content ourselves with the humbler office of recording the fact; for an illustrious proof of which we appeal to THE HEAD MASTER OF RUGBY SCHOOL.

Dr. Arnold is pleased to tell us, in the Introduction to this volume of Sermons, that—

—it would be affectation to dissemble his knowledge that these Sermons will be received in many quarters with a strong prejudice against them.

He then adds—

I cannot regret this as far as regards the followers of a party; to such, be the party what it may, I cannot wish to write acceptably. But for those who are not tied to any party, who love truth and goodness for their own sakes, and who are willing to think for themselves, I should greatly grieve if they were to be prevented by any prejudice from reading fairly and confidently what they will find in these volumes.—Introduction, p. iv.

“The followers of a party!” Of *whom*, and of *what* party does Dr. Arnold here write so contemptuously? Does he forget that he is a minister of the Church of England? Is it for such a functionary to boast of his scorn for the followers of a party, or to court the liberal applause only of those, who are willing “to think for themselves?”

The love of truth for its own sake, and the privilege of thinking for himself, are claims which a *sworn* defender of the *doctrines* and the *discipline* of a particular Church, might, without impeachment of his wisdom, we submit, forbear to urge, in this spirit of taunting self-sufficiency! For how stands the case with Dr. Arnold? He is a *priest*; however he may repudiate the name, he is a *priest* of the Church of England, and bound, therefore, by the solemnity of an oath, again and again repeated, to preach her peculiar views of Christianity, as developed in her Liturgy, her Articles, and her Homilies; and to maintain her discipline in all its forms. Is Dr. Arnold then, we ask, at liberty to “*think for himself*,” as if his search after truth were, in legal phrase, “*res integra*?” Is he not pledged, we ask, “*so to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, AND AS THIS CHURCH AND REALM HATH RECEIVED THE SAME?*” \*

---

\* See the “Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests.”

Dr. Arnold will reply, we are aware, that he *has* abided by his ordination vows. Allowing this to be true, for the sake of argument, (whether it be indeed so, we shall presently see,) why does our learned author prate about those "who are not tied to any party?" "Be the party what it may, he cannot wish to write acceptably to it"!! What! not if it should be the party of his *own Church*? No, indeed; in this *liberal* age, when zeal for forms of discipline is judged to be sheer priestcraft, and contention for modes of faith is decried for narrow-minded bigotry, *all* that Christians should maintain, is an indifferent love for "all sorts and conditions of men," unfettered by any partialities for "the household of faith," the dogmata of *creeds*, and the established rites of national *worship*!

I have wished, (writes our author,) to inculcate christian unity, the unity of the Spirit; and therefore have condemned that craving for unity of opinion and of form by which the true unity is rendered impossible.—Introduction, p. v.

This is the cant of every schismatic—"Let us agree to differ;" but it is utterly at variance with the word of God, which forbids religious divisions as carnal, and makes it imperative upon Christians not only to keep "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," but to "continue stedfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship;" to "speak the same thing;" to be "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment;" and to "glorify God with one mouth." "Be perfectly joined together in the same judgment," says *St. Paul*. Craving for unity of *opinion* is to be condemned, says *Dr. Arnold*. "Glorify God with one mouth," and "speak the same thing," says *the Apostle*. By no means; desire for unity of religious forms of worship is to be condemned, says the *Head Master of Rugby School*. "*Utrum horum mavis accipe,*" say we!

Dr. Arnold assures his readers, that *he attaches but little respect to a large proportion of what is called divinity*. (Introduction, p. viii.) He might have added, with equal modesty and truth, that he attaches just the same respect to many precepts of Holy Writ, and to much of the discipline of the Church at whose altars it is his office to minister. In the largeness of his general charity, he can prefer *Aristotle* and *Bacon* to *Bull* and *Pearson*; and of such narrow-minded theologians as have "laboured to erect systems of dogmatical divinity," he seizes every opportunity of disparagement, and would, therefore, "*put aside the presumption of much of our actual theology*." (Introduction, p. xxx.)

What a mere nose of wax! How conveniently vague this phraseology! "*Much of our actual theology!*" How much? is the question to be solved; and as Dr. Arnold has not explicitly told us, let us examine his volume, and try thence to extract an answer. We naturally turn to the twenty-fourth sermon, which is headed with the running title—"CREEDS," as most likely to afford us the information which we are

seeking. What do our readers guess is *the text* selected by our author for his discourse upon this delicate topic? It reminds us strongly of that witty divine, Lawrence Sterne, who recommends Acts ii. 9—11, as a text suitable for *any* sermon by *any* preacher upon *any* subject. After this example, the Head Master of Rugby takes for his text to this sermon upon "*Creeds*," Acts iv. 24: "They lifted up their voice with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, who hast made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is."

We have no space for observation upon the *garbled* manner in which the verse is quoted by Dr. Arnold; we forbear to remark upon the unjustifiable severance from the context, which the preacher, to serve his purpose, has ventured to adopt. Let these things pass; we confine ourselves to more serious points. Our author asserts, in the opening of this discourse, that "these words, and those which follow them, may be called the earliest and best specimen of the nature of a christian CREED, when used in the public service of the Church;"—where it is to be regarded, "not as reviving the memory of old disputes, and a sort of declaration of war against those who may not agree with us in them, but as principally a free and triumphant confession of thanksgiving to God for all the mighty works which he has done for us."—Pp. 305, 306.

In the first place, we crave the privilege of stating that this hymn of thanksgiving is not what we understand by a *creed* at all; and, we venture to say, that Dr. Arnold is the *first* divine who has *so* named it. In the second place, it is our duty to protest against the strange and new-fangled doctrine of our author, that the Apostles' *Creed*, as used in the daily Service of our Church, partakes "*much more of the nature of a triumphant hymn*," than of a *confession of christian faith*! It is impossible to conceive a greater mistake; nor is there the least ground for the notion; and we challenge Dr. Arnold to produce a single authority for his fond fancy! Did our limits permit, we could shew by ten thousand witnesses, that this *creed* is "*a summary*," as Wheatly says, "*of fundamental doctrines*;" or "*a brief comprehension of the objects of our christian faith*," as Pearson writes; or "*a standard of belief*," according to Dr. Nares; but we content ourselves with *one* testimony, fearful of wearying our readers with unnecessary argument upon a question so plain. We quote from Dr. Nares's Discourses on the Three Creeds.

"Tria sunt symbola; primum Apostolicum, secundum Nicenum, tertium Athanasii; primum factum est AD FIDEI INSTRUCTIONEM; secundum ad fidei explanationem; tertium ad fidei defensionem. This is the account of Ludolphus of Saxony, in his Life of Christ; and the second, which is that of our own countryman, Alexander de Ales, who wrote in the thirteenth century, is similar—*Causa multiplicationis symbolorum fuit triplex; INSTRUCTIO FIDEI, veritatis explanatio, erroris expulsio; the*



sum of the whole being merely this, that the first, or Apostles' Creed, is a mere exposition or statement of the primary articles of christian faith . . . . It is a true '*instructio fidei*,' or '*regula fidei*,' rule of faith, as it is termed by Irenæus, Tertullian, and other ancient fathers; or among the Greeks, ὁπος and ἐκδόσις πίστεως, which are equivalent,—by Theodoretus, simply πίστις,—by some of the Greek historians μάθημα, γραφή, γράμμα. It contains the primary and fundamental doctrines of Christianity." Not a syllable do we read of the Creed partaking of the nature of a *triumphant hymn*. Can our readers imagine *why* Dr. Arnold, in his latitudinarian liberality, should broach this pedantic whim? It is not that he would convert this "rule of faith" into a vague song, indeed; *that* blasphemy we would not lay to his charge; but the Apostles' Creed, metamorphosed into "a triumphant hymn," may admit of a *liberal* and *free* construction better suited to the lax notions of *Nothingarians*, than the strict interpretation of the "form of sound words," according to the orthodox tenets of the Church of England.

It seems, then, (writes our author,) that that minute dwelling upon every word of the Creeds, which has been the practice of expositors; that careful recording what particular sect or opinion every clause may be considered as combating, so far from being necessary, in order to our using the Creeds aright in our daily service, would actually injure our use of them, by mixing up other thoughts and feelings, by no means akin to those of devotion.—Pp. 309, 310.

We cease to wonder, after this exposé of Dr. Arnold's opinions on the point before us, at his disparagement of Bishops Pearson and Bull in comparison with Aristotle and Bacon! And we proceed to still graver matters in our official examination of the volume on our table.

Dr. Arnold's *tenth* and *eleventh* Sermons, upon Hebrews x. 14, and Hebrews vii. 25, are meant to shew that "*Christ is our Priest*," and "*our only Priest*;" for that *He* alone died for us, and now exclusively intercedes for us in heaven:—

In all our relations with God, Christ, our High Priest, should ever be present with our minds, as alone giving us access to God, and alone purifying our hearts, by his Spirit. In him we have all that we need; and as he is our Priest, without whom we have no boldness to come before the throne of grace, so he is our only Priest, and all others who do in any way pretend to be priests like him, are thieves and robbers, from hearing whom, may he, by his Spirit of truth, save his true sheep for evermore!—P. 133.

From the bottom of our hearts we say, "*Amen! Amen! So be it.*" We altogether coincide with our author's statement, and gladly add our feeble imprimatur to it; but this simple and orthodox position does not embrace all Dr. Arnold's view of the question he is discussing; and therefore he proceeds to new points, than which it is impossible, we think, to conceive any thing more mischievous, more false, more uncalled for by the spirit of the times, or more derogatory to the clerical body, of which he is a member! The Head Master of Rugby

School, preaching, be it observed, to the assembled boys under his special tuition, dares to call the christian priesthood of our Church "A PROFANE SUPERSTITION." (P. 138.) His *ignorance* can be matched only by his *assurance*. He assumes, without warrant, that the term *priest* means a *mediator*; that there is but one *Mediator*, (as we all confess,) between God and man, and that consequently the assumption of the character of *priest* by Protestant ministers, is a "*profane theft, and a superstitious robbery*." But what will be said to this statement of the learned Master of Rugby, should it be proved to have no foundation whereon to stand? Such, however, is the fact. "The word *Priest* is the English of *Presbyter*, and not of *Sacerdos*; there being in our tongue no word in use for *Sacerdos*,—*Priest*, which we use for both, being improperly used for a *Sacrificer*, but naturally expressing a *Presbyter*, the name whereby the apostles call both themselves and those which succeed them in their charge. For who can deny that our word "*Priest*" is corrupted of *Presbyter*? Our ancestors, the Saxons, first used *Preoster*, whence, by a farther contraction, come *Preste* and *Priest*. The high and low Dutch have *Priester*, the French, *Prestre*, Italian, *Prete*, but the Spaniard only speaks full *Presbytero*."\* Our readers will see how futile is the elaborate argument of Dr. Arnold, and how foolish his objections to the title of *Priest* as applied to one of the orders of the christian ministry. But, it is a term greatly liable to mischievous abuse, and must, on that account, be condemned as "a grievous error."

How gladly do very young boys persuade themselves that their age keeps them in the back ground; . . . . . How gladly do elder persons fancy that they, not being ministers of Christ, may be permitted to live less strictly!—P. 135.

And is *this* the logic of this Aristotelian scholar, the Head Master of Rugby? Are we to renounce the christian *priesthood*, aye, even the christian *ministry* too, (for to that extent the argument goes,) because the perverseness of man may abuse it by "gross profaneness, and an abandonment of their christian duties?" We suspect that Dr. Arnold has read Aristotle to little purpose; and therefore we beg leave to quote, for his instruction, the following apposite passage from the *Rhetoric* of that illustrious philosopher. "Εἰ δὲ, ὅτι μεγάλα βλάπτειν ἂν ὁ χρώμενος ἀδίκως τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἐνδύμει τῶν λόγων, τοῦτό τε κοινόν ἐστι κατὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν, πλὴν ἀρετῆς, καὶ μάλιστα κατὰ τῶν χρησιμωτάτων, οἷον ἰσχύος, υἱείας, πλούτου, στρατηγίας· τοῦτοις γὰρ ἂν τις ὠφελείας τὰ μέγιστα, χρώμενος δίκαιως, καὶ βλάπτειν, ἀδίκως."†

Again we refer to the Sermon under review, and read what follows:—

\* Discourses on Divers Texts of Scripture, by Joseph Mede, B.D. London, A.D. 1642.

† Arist. Rhet. Lib. I. c. 1. § 3.

God speaks to us, NOT THROUGH THE MINISTRY OF OTHERS, but directly; his message is in our hands, and it is ours to read it and to receive it. . . . .  
 "Where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, there is ALL THE FULNESS of a Christian Church, for there, by his own promise, is Christ himself in the midst of them."—P. 138.

What mere trash is this! How directly contrary to *Holy Writ*! How in point blank opposition to the *Articles* of our Church!

DR. ARNOLD.

God speaks to us not through the ministry of others.—P. 138.

Where two or three are gathered together, there is all the fulness of a Christian Church."—P. 138.

"God's message is in our hands, and it is ours to read it, and to receive it."—P. 138.

"Without any other interpreter of God's will, or dispensers of the seals of his love to us, we are brought directly into the presence of God through the eternal priesthood of his Son Jesus."—P. 137.

"The superstitious error of making a broad and perpetual distinction between one part of Christ's Church and another."—P. 136.

"Social helplessness and intellectual frivolousness, have been the principal causes of the abandonment by

ST. PAUL.

Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead."—2 Cor. v. 20.

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."—Art. XIX.

"How shall they hear without a preacher?"—Rom. x. 14.

"Understandest thou what thou readeest? and he said, How can I, except some man should guide me?"—Acts viii. 30, 31.

"God hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation."—2 Cor. vi. 18.

"Let a man account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God."—1 Cor. iv. 1.

"A bishop must be . . . . . apt to teach."—1 Tim. iii. 2.

"If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ."—1 Tim. iv. 6.

"These things command and teach." 1 Tim. iv. 4.

"The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."—2 Tim. ii. 2.

"Preach the word; . . . . . exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine."—2 Tim. iv. 2.

"God hath set some in the Church, first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers," &c. &c.—1 Cor. xii. 28.

"The PRIEST'S lips should keep knowledge, and THEY should seek the law at HIS mouth, for HE is the mes-

## DR. ARNOLD.

the Church, of its own government, and leaving it in the hands of the Clergy."—Intro. p. xvi. See too p. xix. where the "separation of Clergy and Laity" is spoken of in terms of reprobation.

"The christian ministry is wholly independent of any pretended apostolical succession," which "was a device to imitate the natural hereditary descent of the old priesthoods, by a succession of adoptions . . . . The Clergy in the second generation after the apostles, had no essential superiority over other men; and thus none being specially marked out by God, either as teachers or governors, the Church enjoyed the common right of all societies, that of appointing its officers by its own laws."—Appendix, p. 425.

"The divine right of the Clergy, if grounded on their apostolical succession is a mischievous superstition."—Appendix, p. 426.

Our limits forbid us to continue this contrast. We beg leave, therefore, summarily to state, in reference to the texts, which we have here quoted, that they flatly contradict the assertions of Dr. Arnold. They shew us an express commission to the ministry, given by Christ himself, with a full power of delegating that gift to others, for the continuation of the christian priesthood "unto the end of the world." Holy Writ abounds with evidence to shew what construction the apostles themselves put on the commission entrusted to their hands, as ministers of God, and "stewards of the mysteries" of Christ. Witness the instances of *Epaphroditus*, (Phil. ii. 25,) *Timothy*, and *Titus*.<sup>\*</sup> The priestly power vouchsafed to themselves they conferred by imposition of hands upon others, and this power so delegated by the apostles was spoken of by them as a grace or gift of God. See Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iv. 14;

## ST. PAUL.

senger of the Lord of hosts."—Mal. ii. 7.

"And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."—Ephes. iv. 11, 12.

"It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time, there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."—*Preface to the Form of Making and Ordaining Bishops, &c. &c., according to the Order of the Church of England.*

"For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee."—Tit. i. 5.

"Lay hands suddenly on no man."—1 Tim. v. 22.

"As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you."—John xx. 21.

"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo! I am with you always, even UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD."—Matt. xxviii. 18—20.

\* See 1 Tim. iii. 1—16; iv. 12—16. 2 Tim. iv. 1—6. Tit. i. 4—12; and chap. ii. and iii.

2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Cor. iv. 1. And this divine gift was supposed to be conferred by human agency, and the laying on of hands; a remarkable example of which is visible in the ordination of St. Paul, even after his miraculous conversion. (Acts xiv. 23.)

"The argument, then, stands thus. We find what we conceive to be an express commission to the ministry given by Christ; we find that it was so understood by the Apostles; that they acted on it; that they ordained men to the priesthood wherever they went; and, in order to provide for the extension and continuation of the ministry, that they gave to certain more exalted officers the same power of ordination, in addition to other privileges of the ministry; that they speak of these privileges as the gift of God, but that they speak of them as bestowed through the instrumentality of man."\*

We might appeal to ecclesiastical history, did our limits permit; we might argue the point of the apostolical succession, by an appeal to *reason*, could reason hope to be heard; but we forbear to fill our pages with arguments on a topic so familiar to our readers as that under discussion, especially as the volume on our table demands yet further notice with reference to matters of equal moment with the preceding topics.

Dr. Arnold not only denies the doctrine of *apostolical succession*, thereby lowering the Clergy, and desecrating the Sacraments of the Church—for in that case they are merely human officers and human ordinances—but maintains, moreover, that the sacramental commemoration of Christ's death needs not the presence of a minister any more than the administration of baptism, which may be performed by any body; and that the power of the keys as committed to sacerdotal hands is a notion too unchristian to bear the light.

We would crave the privilege of addressing ourselves shortly to these three points. We begin with Baptism.

With regard to baptism, Dr. Arnold says, "The question has been decided by the authorities of the Church of England." (Appendix, p. 412.) We challenge the Doctor to produce these authorities; and if they be found only in the sentences of Ecclesiastical Courts, and the practice of unauthorized Laics, we oppose to them the doctrine of our Church, as laid down in her *Articles* and *Rubrics*. The commission to baptize was given by our Redeemer only to his *Apostles*, and by them to their *successors* in the ministry; in conformity with which practice the Twenty-third Article of our Church runs thus:—

"It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or MINISTERING THE SACRAMENTS in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same."

---

\* See Rose's Series of Discourses on the Commission of the Clergy, p. 36.

If it should be alleged, in answer to this statement, that the prohibition extends merely to the *public* performance of the baptismal rite, and that *lay* baptism is allowed in *private* ministrations, we confidently appeal to the office for *Private Baptism*, to prove the fallacy of this distinction. Indeed, *Private Baptism* is forbidden by our Church, except in extreme cases of necessity, "*when need shall compel*;" and even then she carefully confines the ceremony to her *lawful ministers*, according to her *Rubrics* :—

"First, Let the minister of the parish (or, in his absence, any other lawful minister that can be procured,) call upon God; and then the minister shall pour water upon it :"

"If the minister of the same parish did himself baptize the child ;"

"But if the child were baptized by any other lawful minister, then the minister of the parish . . . . shall examine and try whether the child be lawfully baptized or no."

We interrupt the course of our quotations to beg our readers to mark emphatically what follows, and to observe that our Church not only obliges her ministers to examine *generally* into the validity of baptisms alleged to have been performed, but that the *very first* question which they are directed to ask of "those that bring any child to the church, and answer that the same child is already baptized," is this,—

"By whom was this child baptized?"

We arrogate the privilege of asking Dr. Arnold whether a church allowing *lay* baptism could have put *this* searching question? And we fortify ourselves by the authority of *Wheatly*, who thus illustrates the *Rubrics* which we have quoted :—

"Our Church, by prohibiting all from intermeddling in baptism but a *lawful* minister, plainly hints that when baptism is administered by any others, it conveys no benefit or advantage to the child, but only brings upon those who pretend to administer it the guilt of usurping a sacred office."\*

Dr. Arnold contends for the *lay* administration of the Lord's Supper; and asserts that the notion that "there can be no true sacramental commemoration of Christ's death without the presence of a minister," is "MANIFESTLY ABSURD AND PROFANE."—Appendix, p. 411.

Again we quote the 23d Art. of our Church. "Manifestly absurd and profane" as the notion is, the *Church of England* maintains it unequivocally; that church, of which our *consistent* author is a minister! She peremptorily declares that none but *lawful ministers* can "minister the sacraments in the congregation." "Granted," says our author; "*it is most fit, most excellent, as a rule of order and decency, that they who minister should especially wait on their ministry in the very holiest act*

---

\* *Wheatly's Rational Illustration of Common Prayer*, p. 374.

of our christian brotherhood. But they minister not as distinct from their brethren, but as being of their number."—P. 138.

If the communion be as our author declares, "*the very holiest act of our christian brotherhood*," we would venture to suggest, looking at the question in the abstract, that the presence of "*the stewards of the mysteries of God*" at its celebration might be reasonably looked for amongst the ordinances of Him, by whose law they minister in holy things. As unto the sacrament of *Baptism* a *lawful minister* is necessary, (for Christ empowered *only such* to administer *that* rite, "Go, preach and baptize,") so unto the due solemnization of the *Lord's Supper* is it equally necessary that a *lawful minister* should *consecrate* the elements by prayer. Our Church forbids *private communions*,\* and in her office for the Communion of the Sick, it is cautiously provided that there shall be "*three, or two at the least*," besides the sick person and the curate, to partake of the eucharist, whilst an exception to this rule is confined by her to "*contagious times of sickness*;" but on no occasion does she contemplate the celebration of the Communion without the presence of a minister. When superstitious and timid Christians feared that "*the unworthiness of the ministers*" might hinder the effect of the sacraments, the Church did not tell them that private Christians might assemble and administer the Lord's Supper to themselves without the intervention of a priest; but quieted their minds by assuring them that their fears were groundless, inasmuch as the sacraments were "*effectual because of Christ's institution and promise*, although they be ministered by evil men."—Art. XXVI.

There is no room, then, for Dr. Arnold's sneer, touching "*the repetition of a particular form of words by one particular individual*." (Appendix, p. 410.) The Church to which he belongs holds the ministration of her ministers to be necessary and essential to the sacraments, whether administered *privately* or *publicly*; and we esteem it, in the language of Usher, "*monstrous presumption for private persons to meddle with such high mysteries*."† But what shall be said of Dr. Arnold? Is he not an abettor of such "*monstrous presumption*?" Has he not done all that in him lies to lower the dignity of the priestly office; to pour contempt upon the doctrine and the discipline of the Church of England in these lucubrations? And this, too, before an audience of *boys*, who are to be sent forth from Rugby thus imbued with mischievous opinions and "*dangerous deceits*!" Is this an era,—are *these* the days,—is *this* the audience, when, and before which, these heresies are to be preached? A due estimation of the christian sacraments, and the christian priesthood, has been placed, by abler men than Dr. Arnold, amongst the fundamental articles of the

\* Canon, 71.

† Usher's Body of Divinity, p. 412.



christian religion. "If the sacraments be not only signs or emblems of spiritual benefits, but the instituted means of conveying these benefits; and if the ministration of the priesthood as a divine ordinance be necessary to give the sacraments their validity and effect; then are these interwoven into the very substance of Christianity, and inseparable from its general design. So much, indeed, is said in Scripture of the church of God as a spiritual society, subsisting under a visible government, and administered by means of these ordinances, that, to treat the consideration of these points as of little weight, appears to be depreciating, if not the system of Christianity itself, yet the mode which Infinite Wisdom has ordained of carrying it into effect."\* Alas! that such a man as the author before us, a D.D., a schoolmaster, and a *priest*, should be found amongst the traducers of our most sacred institutions and offices! "*Quis talia fando*," &c.

But, in good truth, we have still further fault to find with our author, who denies to the Clergy the power of declaring *absolution*. If they have no such power, why, we ask, is the privilege of reading the absolution confined to *priests* by our Church? SHE says expressly, that God "*hath given power and commandment to HIS MINISTERS to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins.*" But what says DR. ARNOLD, that consistent minister of the Church? that "*magnus Apollo*" of Radical Infidels and Liberal Schismatics? He says, "*It is idle to talk of a minister having an exclusive power of declaring what we have heard already from the very source to which alone he is indebted for it.*" (Appendix, p. 414.) But our Church talks thus, we see; she talks *idly*, then; and she not only *talks* thus *idly*, but *actually* restrains the remission of sin to her *priests*! Can Dr. Arnold remain any longer in the communion of such a church? He tells his readers that "it would be a strong presumption against any man's understanding, if he did not venerate and listen to the wisdom of those great men whom God has raised up at different times, as the intellectual lights of the world." (Introduction, p. vi.) It is this truth that comforts us in the review of Dr. Arnold's volume, which runs counter to all the great authorities whom, in questions of ecclesiastical polity, and theological doctrines, we have been wont to venerate and to follow; and we feel but little alarm, whatever may be our disgust, at the assaults of Dr. Arnold upon the dignity and the power of the ministers of the Church of England, thus injuriously assailed, thus contumeliously degraded, when their sacred function can be approached with hope of triumphant hostility only by one who ventures to hurl the arrows of his scorn against such men as *Hooker*, and *Bull*, and *Pearson*; and who may dare then

---

\* Van Mildert's Bampton Lecture, p. 151.



to aspire to the honour of a *guide* in matters of religion, when their immortal pages shall cease to be read !

If, after this comment upon the volume before us, which we thus dismiss without further remark, our readers should wish for more detailed information as to its contents, we beg leave to refer them to the pages of the work itself, of which we confess we have already had more than enough.



ART. II.—*The Autobiography of a Dissenting Minister.* London : Smith, Elder, & Co. 1834. Pp. viii. 227.

"*TRUTH will out,*"—" *Murder will out,*" are sayings which cannot be gainsaid. They are fundamental maxims, established upon evidence which is as extensive as the range of human nature ; for they are based upon a principle commensurate with the scriptural adage, "*Be sure your sin will find you out.*" Applying these maxims to the state of affairs now agitating between the Church and Dissent, we have, in the work before us, an additional proof of the correctness of the positions upon which national proverbs are founded, and of the unerring certainty with which truth, however hampered or impeded, will eventually rise to its intended and natural level. We look upon publications of this kind as of incalculable value ; not mere ephemeral bubbles upon the great stream of literary trifling, but as substantial parts of the solid frame-work of the philosophy of the age. We know that several of our contemporaries have laboured hard to disprove the authenticity of the details, as well as the genuineness of the character of the author of this Autobiography ; but we, unquestionably, believe both, not because his assertions tally with our prejudices, but because his narrative so perfectly agrees with the theory of dissent, and the examples every where afforded by dissent, that we cannot doubt occurrences so consonant to reason and experience. Believing, then, that this work details what has really happened, we shall make no scruple of using it by way of showing what Dissent really is ; thereby justifying ourselves in the eyes of those who may, perhaps, suppose that we have occasionally indulged in unjust suspicions against those who worship without the walls of the Establishment.

The author states in his Preface, that his object " is to set forth, in a more popular and homely form than that of abstract argument, the insuperable evils of the voluntary system." (p. v.)

He is perfectly assured and convinced, that dissent, bad enough as it is, would be yet worse, were it not for the existence and operation of the Established Church. . . . Were the Establishment to be destroyed, there would

presently be a struggle amongst the sects for dominion and power; and secular enough as dissent already is, it would become greatly more so, if the vast fabric of the Church were demolished. In the ensuing pages, there has been no attempt at exaggeration or high colouring; every thing has been set down calmly, and almost literally; care, however, being always taken to avoid every tendency to personality. The writer, also, is well satisfied that these brief notices of the experience of one individual contain much that is common to many; others beside himself have undergone precisely the same kind of annoyances,—for much as the dissenters may boast themselves friends of liberty, they exercise a most troublesome dominion over their pastors. Here, then, they may read their own characters, and may learn not to boast themselves too much of their religious superiority, nor to set themselves up as religious dictators to that Establishment, by which they have been hitherto tolerated and rendered respectable in a political view, and not altogether inefficacious in a religious one.—Preface, pp. vi. vii.

The very nature of this work requires us to be liberal in quotations; any observations of our own would be but tame after the *bonâ fide* sketches from the life of our author. We shall, therefore, reprint as much as serves our purpose, recommending our readers to complete the picture of dissent by a perusal of the work in full. Thus explicitly does the author commence his undertaking:—"I am not going to make a fiction that shall look like truth; but rather, to exhibit a truth which shall look like fiction." (P. 2.)

I am the youngest of five, and my father, at the time of my birth, and for many years after, was a linen-draper in the Borough of Southwark. He had been brought up a strict dissenter, and was as pleased to trace his descent from the nonconformists of the days of Charles II. as any Welshman can be to trace his pedigree up to Noah's ark. My mother also was a Puritan by descent, and all their friends and acquaintances were more or less of the same class. I was imbued from my earliest childhood with the idea that nothing good could exist out of the pale of dissent. None but the books of our own sect were ever admitted into our house, and as much as possible all care was taken that we should not hold intercourse with the people of the world; for so we designated all who did not belong to our sect. Sometimes, indeed, it was absolutely necessary to meet with individuals belonging to the Established Church, but on such occasions, I observed, that so little conversation passed, that we seemed to be in the company of foreigners, who could not speak our language. As for going into a church, we should as soon have thought of going into a play-house, which building we were taught to regard as the house of the devil;—we did not indeed call the church by the same name, but we regarded it with almost the same abhorrence, and we used to speak of a church parson as of one who had no religion, morals, or even understanding.—Being of a rather ardent temperament, I entered into the spirit of our family religion with no slight degree of zeal, and I regret to say, that the religion of my early youth, which was particularly commended by the pastor of the flock to which my father and mother belonged, consisted for the most part of a very pharisaic contempt for others. I used to make very many severe remarks on the religion of the world in general, and of our own more immediate neighbours in particular. I recollect very distinctly the indignation with which on Sunday I was in the habit of declaiming against the sin of Sabbath-breaking, when I saw persons setting out in gigs or on horseback on country excursions; and if I read in the newspapers any account of persons being drowned in the river on Sunday, I felt rather more delight in this manifestation of a Divine judgment, than rightly became a Christian and a youth. I was invariably attentive to the

discourses of our pastor, but I rather think, upon recollection, that I listened to them so closely, prompted more by the vanity of being afterwards able to repeat the heads of the sermons, than by any truly serious feeling, or any desire after religious instruction.—Pp. 2—4.

Our hero goes to school, where he learned to construe Virgil by the help of Duncan, and Horace by the help of Smart; and where he did not learn to write Latin verse, but did something infinitely better, learned to ridicule those who did. With his contempt for classical learning increased his ambition to soar above the counter; and as his father fell off in business, the only profession open to him was that of preaching. He was, therefore, sent to college, but whether Highbury or not, is not stated.

I think, if I recollect rightly, the standard of admissibility into this college was, that the candidate should be able to read Horace, and that he should have made some progress in Greek grammar. I believe there was no objection to Smart's Horace.—Pp. 10, 11.

I therefore, a few days before the time appointed for my examination, procured an edition of Horace which contained some account of the metres, but I found, to my great dismay, that the treatise on the metres was written in a very difficult sort of Latin, which I could by no means make out, nor could I make head or tail of the different systems of verse which were there set down. I closed the book in despair, and I became more and more convinced that my schoolmaster was decidedly right in determining that metres were of no use.

The day for my examination arrived, and I went with a swelling but trembling heart to my pastor's house to drink tea, with Smart's Horace in one pocket, and a Greek grammar in the other. In my eagerness and haste not to be too late, I was a little before my time, and I was shewn into the study, where I found myself with no other company than the books. Curious enough it was, that among the books which were lying on the table, I should find Smart's Horace and Duncan's Virgil. I was delighted to discover this similarity of classical taste between my pastor and myself. The sight of these books was indeed delightful to me—though at the moment I was not aware of the fulness of the relief that they promised me. I afterwards discovered, and I record it here lest I should forget the fact, that this reverend gentleman, who was appointed to be my examiner, was as much afraid of me, as I was of him; he was apprehensive that, if he set me to construe an ode of Horace, and I should be unable to construe it, he should be also as unable to set me right, for he, like many others, as I have since ascertained, possessed the reputation of much greater erudition than had really fallen to his lot. When he came into the study, I took a great deal of pains to look as if I had not been looking upon the table, and I think I succeeded. We went into another room to tea, and after tea the important work of examination commenced. I trembled a little, but not so much as I should have done, if I had not seen Smart's Horace and Duncan's Virgil on the table in the next room.

I think I can remember the examination almost word for word; therefore, with the reader's leave, I will set it down as it occurred. My pastor was the first to speak, and he began by saying, in a very pleasant and gentle voice,—“So, young gentleman, I find that you are desirous of undertaking the office of the ministry, and for this purpose you are a candidate for admission into — College. I suppose you are aware that the directors of that institution, being sensible of the great importance of a learned ministry, make a point of requiring all young men who seek to be admitted there, to undergo a previous examination as to their classical attainments.”

It was well for me that I had seen Smart's Horace and Duncan's Virgil in the next room, or I should certainly have betrayed symptoms of great agitation.

As it was, however, I replied with much self-possession, "I am perfectly aware of it, sir."

In all affairs of this kind, there is nothing like putting a good face on the matter. I was, indeed, astonished at my own boldness; but I found that it answered. My examiner, without hesitation, replied smilingly, "In your case, of course, the examination must be a mere matter of form; for considering the high reputation of the school at which you received your education, and the excellent character which you sustained there, no doubt can exist as to your competency, only I must be able to say that I have had proof of your classical knowledge. Now the directors of this college, in order to fix the standard of proficiency high enough, require that a young man, before he is admitted, be able to construe Horace."

I was just on the point of taking Smart's Horace out of my pocket, but my pastor, hastily rising up, said, "I will fetch a Horace out of the next room, and perhaps you will be kind enough to do me the favour to construe a line or two."

He was soon back again, bringing with him, not Smart's Horace, but the Delphin Horace, and presenting it to me open at the first ode of the first book, he said, "Read where you please."

I accordingly began, and very boldly proceeded with the first ode, construing it with as much accuracy and elegance as I could. I had not gone very far, when my examiner graciously and kindly interrupted me, saying, "That will do, sir, perfectly well! admirably well! You not only construe Horace, but you enter into the spirit of your author. I shall have great pleasure in making a favourable report of your scholarship." Then after a moment's silence, and with a little hesitation, the gentleman proceeded, "Pray, sir, at your school did you learn the metres?"

I felt rather uneasy at this question; but having got through the construing with so much *éclat*, I was emboldened, and fearlessly replied, "Mr. ——— did not think metres of much use."

At this reply of mine, I thought at the time, and I have had greater reason to think so since, my examiner felt somewhat relieved, and he replied with great alacrity, "I am quite of his opinion; and I believe that at the college where you are going, the same opinion is entertained. Some pedantic individuals have occasionally endeavoured to introduce into our seminaries of learning an attention to these trifles, but good sound sense has got the better of the pedants. Indeed, sir, what can we know of the Latin quantity? We know not how the Romans pronounced their prose, and we are much less likely to know how they pronounced their poetry." Thereupon the examiner smiled, and I smiled, and the Delphin Horace was laid upon the table, and our conversation flew off to other topics, and I found that I had passed my examination most triumphantly, and that the learned college was anticipating a valuable addition to its literary reputation in my learned person.—Pp. 13—18.

The course of collegiate education is next laid open to us, and we take the following as an exceeding witty sample of what sort of a thing a dissenter's academical course is like.

Extemporaneous prayer used to be considered, and by some persons still is, as the result of a momentary inspiration; but with the generality of those who use it, it is most likely the result of habit, of knack,—even as any other kind of off-hand dexterity in the use of words. If, then, extemporaneous praying, or extemporaneous preaching, be a desirable qualification, and if it be only to be acquired by habit and practice, the habit must be formed at an early period. Early enough is the attempt made in dissenting colleges;—I could, were I so disposed, enumerate many ludicrous anecdotes of ridiculous blunders made by young beginners in the art of extempore prayer; but I shall not enter into particulars, for there may be some persons now living, who may not be pleased to be reminded of the follies of their youth,—I say follies, not sins, for what-

ever sin there might be in the matter, lay rather at the door of those elderly persons who permitted and prompted young persons thus to commit themselves. In the college now referred to, it was a standing rule, that each student in rotation, after the completion of the first year of his academic course, should conduct the family devotion in the evening. It was not expressly stated that the prayer should be extemporaneous, but it was generally understood so, and I never remember to have witnessed any deviation from that practice. It is indeed true that some few, not daring to trust themselves to the impulse of the moment, and to the words which might present themselves on the occasion, did previously compose a prayer, which they committed to memory; but I feel very confident, that, had any student read this composed prayer from the paper on which it was written, he would have met with reproof from the theological president. Now when it is considered that students were admissible into this institution at the early age of sixteen, and that individuals of various measures of talent were, of course, all expected to perform the same kind of duty, it may very naturally be supposed, that by some it would be but awkwardly done. I remember even now, with a painful and mortifying distinctness, several scenes in which devotion has been converted into diversion. Frequently would some trembling novice, forgetting what he had learnt by heart, abruptly pause in the midst of his prayer, painfully exerting his recollection to gather up the broken thread; and frequently would some inexperienced youth, trusting to his power of extemporizing, fluently commence with a bold and steady effusion of devotional common-places, and then suddenly would he become confused, forgetting what he had said, and perhaps repeating it; or, becoming more bewildered, would ramble into all manner of incoherences, and talk such nonsense as no waking man would think of under other circumstances. To young men whose risible faculties are not under due subjection, such scenes are highly provocative of laughter; and I well remember the difficulty with which many suppressed the actual explosion of loud laughter, while almost every side was shaking. Surely the acquisition of the knack of extemporaneous prayer must be a matter of immense value, when such means are used to gain it. Much has been said of late concerning the irreverence with which prayers are attended to in the English Universities, but nothing can equal the indecorum of exposing prayer itself to the risk of becoming the means of merriment. Besides, if an extemporaneous devotional fluency be the result of inspiration, what prevents that inspiration from being as perfect in the case of youth and inexperience, as it is in more advanced life? But the truth is, that almost all parties know that the matter depends upon intellect and habit.—Pp. 31—34.

In the academic establishment which I have been describing above, the utmost liberality of political opinion prevailed, and frequently political topics were given to us as the subject of our themes; and I believe it was generally considered a piece of academic etiquette to take the anti-national side of a question. There were several shades and gradations of opinion, from the sober whig down to the conceited and roaring democrat. Paine's *Age of Reason* was of course not in great esteem among us, but his *Rights of Man* were highly popular: nor did we much relish the Socinianism of Dr. Priestley, but we admired him as a martyr to the cause of liberty; and though we adopted not the Arianism of Dr. Price, we gloried in his avowal of the right of the people to call kings to account, and to cashier them for misconduct. We regarded America as the *ne plus ultra* of political perfection,—as the pure land of liberty, civil and religious. We hated the name of William Pitt, and all but worshipped that of Charles James Fox. We could not very well understand Tooke's *Divisions of Purley*, but we venerated his politics. We had, in our college library, in four volumes, the trial of Thelwall, Hardy, Horne Tooke, and others, for high treason; and we regarded Sir Francis Burdett as one of the first of living characters. Indeed, whatever theological or political prejudices I had been imbued with under my paternal roof, these were by no means abated or diminished by the society or pursuits of the college; but though they were not immediately and palpably diminished, yet I think that ultimately, by means of

the excess to which the opinions were carried, and the bigotry with which they were maintained, the hold which they originally had of my mind was very greatly shaken. This effect did not appear at once, but was developed several years after, much to my annoyance. I believe that one of the reasons why we never read Aristophanes was, that he makes democracy look so exquisitely ridiculous. The difficulty of the author could be no objection, for to our classical tutor one author was quite as easy as another, if it had but a Latin version at the bottom of the page, and we used to be very proud of reading Æschylus, Thucydides, and Longinus. The fact is, that the eminence of our classical tutor's scholarship was so great, that he could read any Greek author with a Latin version, and none without it.—Pp. 37—39.

I do not indeed wonder, considering all that I have seen and heard of dissenting places of academic instruction, that the dissenters themselves feel an anxiety after admission into the universities; yet I do not see how that will much mend the matter, unless there be also conceded to them an eligibility to all places of honour and profit, which belong to the several colleges, for these prizes stimulate the diligence of the young men. Nor, indeed, do I think that those persons who are hearty dissenters, would choose to run the risk of sending their sons to these ecclesiastical establishments. The fact is, that the dissenters, in urging forward this question, have no very distinct apprehension of remote consequences, but they have two unpleasant feelings which they wish to get rid of; and one of these feelings is, the consciousness that their own ministers, though not absolutely ignorant and uneducated, are yet very superficial in their learning, and very shallow in their general acquirements; and the other feeling is, that they are marked, and so far degraded, by the exclusion from academic honours. Yet, I must say, that if they were admitted to the honours, and excluded from the profits of the universities, they would feel the degradation much more, and would make a much louder cry about the grievance. If I may be permitted to use a somewhat ludicrous comparison, I would say, that the dissenters, being barefooted, are crying for shoes, which shoes, when they get them, will pinch their feet, and then they will cry more loudly and more importunately than ever—not to get rid of the shoes, but to have them cut, stretched, and distorted for their own ease and accommodation, and then the shoes will be spoilt.—Pp. 41—43.

Having passed his collegiate ordeal, our author goes out to preach on trial, as the wont is of nonconformists; and here ambition struggling against intrigues, in which the chief agents are tallow-chandlers and dry-salters, he vainly aspires to the ministry of a chapel with carriages at the door, and is obliged to be content with a mere plebeian tabernacle. The mystery of preaching is handled dexterously, and the following anecdote is introduced to illustrate it.

In my preaching also, I took particular pains to show that I understood Greek and Hebrew, for I seldom preached a sermon in which I did not take especial care to set the translators right; whether my text was from the Old or from the New Testament, I always told my hearers how the expression ought to have been translated, and what was the peculiar force and meaning of the original Greek or Hebrew. I never went so far as to quote Greek or Hebrew in the pulpit, or even Latin; I should have called that pedantry. Now that I am on this topic, an anecdote occurs to my recollection, which, as it is somewhat amusing and appropriate, I think I may as well relate in this place. A fellow-student of mine, who had more ambition after the reputation, than talent or diligence for the acquisition of literature, preaching once at a country chapel or meeting-house, where the audience were for the most part rustics of the simplest class, suddenly became very eloquent, and burst forth in a declamation in praise of the fathers of the church, talking very learnedly about St. Augustine.



St. Jerome, St. Chrysostom, and others; at length he exclaimed, "Listen, I pray you, to the pathetic and soul-stirring words of St. Chrysostom, to which no translation can possibly do justice: *Propria quæ maribus tribuuntur mascula dicas.*" Just at the moment of his uttering this splendid quotation, his eye caught sight of our classical tutor, who happened by some strange accident to be one of his hearers. The orator was for a moment thunderstruck, and was just going to blush and look foolish, but he had presence of mind to think that no good was to be got by blushing, so he put a bold face on the matter, and proceeded. The tutor never took any notice of the quotation, and the orator, when he tells the story, always adds that the classical gentleman took it for Greek.—Pp. 86, 87.

The pastoral duties in which our hero was employed, were highly edifying to him and his hearers.

I was for some time very highly delighted, when on Monday mornings I used to stroll about the town, and look in first at one house and then at another, and hear repeated commendations of the sermons which I had delivered on the preceding day. I cannot say that my fatigues on Sunday were very great, but it did so happen that I acquired a habit of lounging about on Monday mornings under pretence of resting from the fatigues of the Sunday. I must not indeed deny that the pleasure of hearing my sermons praised, contributed very much to keep up the practice of my Monday morning visitings. By this habit I was also winning the hearts of the people, and weaning them away from their old pastor, who was not quite so much of a gossip as I was. There is something very imposing in the phrase, "pastoral visit," but I fear that the thing itself is greatly abused, and that in too many instances they become mere talk and idle waste of time. Perhaps some of my readers may be amused with a description of one of my Monday morning lounges, and with an enumeration of the sort of people on whom I used to call, and the manner in which they used to talk about my sermons and prayers. The minister's dwelling, in which I was an inmate, was on the outskirts of the town, and in my way from his house to the market-place, in which stood the circulating library and reading-room, it was absolutely necessary for me to go all through the High-street, in which several of the congregation lived, and all that lived in the High-street kept shops, and all that kept shops, kept their shop-doors open, and it would have been very rude in me to pass by the shops of my hearers without turning my head round to give them the passing recognition of a nod. As Monday was also rather a leisure day with the shopkeepers in the town of K—, the natural consequence of my turning round to nod, was my turning in to chat. This appeared purely accidental, but I knew it was intentional, and I believe they knew it to be so too. To whom, then, did it appear accidental? I really don't know, but I always used to endeavour to contrive to make it seem so.—Pp. 88—90.

There is a very amusing history of one of these visits, in which the heroine was a grocer's daughter, with "bright little eyes, and a little upward twist in the tip of her nose," who was an excellent judge of sermons, and who acted the part of parish critic; but we must skip it, to introduce another.

The next open shop-door at which I was in the habit of calling, was at a corn-chandler's. It was a very small shop, having just room enough for a narrow counter, and a row of narrow bins behind it, with horse-beans, oats, barley, pollard, and such like articles; and all was very neat,—and the master was very neat, and his wife was very neat: they were elderly people, and themselves and one maid-servant were all their establishment. The master was always in the shop, sitting on a high stool at a little desk, looking at his

ledger through his spectacles; the mistress was always in the little parlour behind the shop; and the maid was always in the little kitchen behind the parlour. I will not say that the corn-chandler and his wife were actually dumb, because I knew they were not; but to all practical purposes they were as near to it as possible. When I went into the shop, all that the master of it would say, was, "How do you do? Mrs. — is in the parlour." And when I went into the parlour, all that Mrs. — would say, was, "How do you do? did you see Mr. — as you came through the shop?" This was the extent of their vocabulary, and as they neither of them read, and neither of them thought, I could not extort another word from them except the monosyllable "yes" or "no," to any thing that I chanced to say. They certainly merited, in a very high degree, the eulogium which was universally bestowed upon them, that they were inoffensive and quiet sort of people,—but I could not make my visits to them very long, for if I had, I should have fallen asleep, and that would have been rude.

A little farther on in the street was a very smart-looking shop in the Birmingham and Sheffield and general cutlery line, kept by a middle-aged bachelor, a stout swaggering sort of a man, who would not have been a fool if he had not thought himself wise. He was held in very great esteem by himself, but in less by his neighbours, and especially by the congregation, who did not think him a sufficiently serious man; nor indeed can I say that he was very serious;—he was a stickler for liberty, and though I do not believe that he ever had the *Age of Reason* in his possession, I am certain that he possessed and admired the *Rights of Man*. He was an active man both in the town and in the chapel. Though he was a dissenter, yet he was a regular attendant, and a great speaker at parish vestry meetings, and particularly delighted in what he called "basting the parson." I should be sorry to say any thing uncharitable of any one, or even to report an uncharitable saying, but I think there was a great deal of truth and point in a saying that was current in the town of K—, concerning this gentleman, namely, that he was only a dissenter because he was not a churchman. His parlour was ornamented with many portraits and busts of public characters, such as Cobbett, Sir Francis Burdett, Colonel Wardle, Benjamin Franklin, Lord Erskine, General Washington, Napoleon Bonaparte, and Dr. Priestley. This last picture was a great stumbling-block to many serious persons in the congregation, who thought that it gave strong indications of a leaning to Socinianism. The cutler, however, strenuously denied the justice of the inference, and contended that he revered Dr. Priestley as a man of science, and as a friend of civil and religious liberty. He was also a constant reader of Cobbett's *Political Register*, and of the *Monthly Magazine*, at that time published by Sir Richard Phillips,—but I don't think that he was a great admirer of the *Evangelical Magazine*. This gentleman was always very civil and friendly to me, but he could very seldom remember any part of my sermons. Being a person of some considerable wealth, he had a square pew to himself in one corner of the chapel under the gallery, and by way of distinction there was a short calimanco curtain drawn round the top of it, and I greatly fear that he took advantage of that curtain to go to sleep behind it,—for nobody could see him.—Pp. 97—100.

We do not know where we could find a better commentary on a recent celebrated Chancery suit, than in the statement which immediately succeeds.

While I was in the town of K—, there happened one of those changes which have been by far too common in England of late years, I mean the transmutation of a Presbyterian into an Unitarian chapel. I introduce this anecdote here, because I am reminded of it by the reminiscence of the cutler. The change of this chapel from Presbyterian to Socinian, or Unitarian, as they were pleased to term it, took place in the following manner. There was in the



town of K—— a large Presbyterian chapel, capable of accommodating at least a thousand hearers, and the time had been, in the memory of some old persons living when I was there, that the chapel was quite full, even crowded, for many persons came to worship there from the neighbouring villages. But of late years the congregation had sadly dwindled away, for the preacher, though a very good sort of man, as he was called, was exceedingly indefinite in his religious views, and generally confined himself to moral discourses, and those of a very meagre kind; or if by chance he touched upon any gospel truths, he slurred them over with a most unprofitable generalization. So at last when he died, the whole number of hearers amounted to little more than seventy or eighty persons. There was among them one individual of considerable opulence, a brewer, who was a gentleman-like sort of a man, and one of the leading personages in the town. This gentleman scarcely made any secret of his Socinian principles, for he possessed almost all Dr. Priestley's writings, and used to be very free in his conversation on religious topics. He also used to take in a Socinian magazine, called, I believe, *The Monthly, or Theological Repository*, and which has of late years assumed a more general character. Although the Presbyterian chapel was nearly deserted of its worshippers, there were not lacking candidates for the vacant pulpit, for each one hoped that by his talents and exertions he might revive the fallen interest. The brewer, however, was fully determined to have a Socinian; and for that purpose he made several new subscribers, who outvoted the old ones, and so a Socinian preacher was established in the old Presbyterian chapel. So the old subscribers fell off, and went away to other chapels, or the church, and the new subscribers, not caring much about the matter, did not stay long there; the consequence of which was, that the opulent brewer, and two or three of his friends, and some dozen or two of his dependants, had the chapel all to themselves, but they had not the entire burden of supporting the minister, for there was an endowment belonging to the chapel, which formed the greater part of the preacher's salary. The preacher, who was a very young man, was exceedingly conceited, and for a minister, I think far too much of a dandy. He looked as if he thought himself a very enlightened personage, destined to produce a great mental revolution in the town of K——, by preaching to the people a new system of theology which had never been thought or heard of before. He had not been long installed in his new situation, when he sent the town-crier round the town with handbills, announcing that he was going to deliver a course of lectures on the principal doctrines of Christianity, just as if there had been no faithful preachers of Christian doctrine before his time; but the fact was, that his lectures were to be *against* the principal doctrines of Christianity. But the people of K—— did not pay much heed to him, a few only of the brewer's friends went once or twice out of civility to him, and they were soon tired, for they did not like to see a place of worship converted into a forum for sceptical discussion. Among the rest, however, the cutler went, and more than once, and no one wondered at it; for let him say what he would, it was as clear as day-light that he had a strong hankering after Socinianism. He very much wished me to go and hear the man, in order that I might refute him,—so he said; but I strongly and truly suspected that the young Socinian preacher was desirous of obtaining an antagonist merely for the sake of acquiring some celebrity, and making a noise in a quiet town. I consulted with the old gentleman whose pulpit I supplied, and he said, "Let him alone, let him alone, ten years hence he will be either a Christian or an infidel; he is now neither one nor the other." Finding that he could not attract a theological notice from the dissenters, the young man tried what he could do with the Church; so he attacked the Establishment, preached against tithes, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Athanasian creed; he also wrote long letters in the county newspaper, insulting the whole body of the clergy, calling them, by implication, knaves or fools, but telling them at the same time, what a great respect he had for their hearts and understandings. It was all in vain; he could excite no attention:

for all that he could say was but a repetition of the old sophisms of Tom Paine, and others of that class, which were all new to this young gentleman, but stale enough to the rest of the world. I have introduced this matter in this place, because it was suggested by a mention of this liberal cutler, who, notwithstanding all his declarations, did, some time after I left the town of K——, join himself to the Socinians. I used very frequently to talk to him about the matter, and to caution him concerning the danger in which he stood, but he replied that it was but fair to hear both sides, and that he was not afraid that his faith could be shaken, and that it was only following the advice of the apostle, to try all things, and hold fast that which is best. But I thought that a man could not know much about Christianity if he did not know when he had got that which is best.—Pp.100—105.

Our next extracts treat of the *unity of schism*, and the beauties of the voluntary system.

Just at this time there happened one of those divisions which are but too common among dissenters, and that was in a large town about fifteen miles distant from the place at which I was then residing. There was a large chapel in that town, numerous and respectably attended, the minister of which had officiated in the place upwards of five-and-twenty years. When he first came, he succeeded an elderly man whose powers, never very great, had been attenuated to next to nothing during his latter years. The new minister, when he was new, was immensely popular. He was regarded as a very Solomon for wisdom, and a Demosthenes for eloquence. His congregation, had it not been that their shops and merchandize required their attention, would have been glad to sit all day long, all the week through, to hear him preach. But, alas! hot love is soonest cold. For the first five years he was a God to them, for the next fifteen a mortal, and for the last five a devil; and yet I was afterwards told by unbiassed observers, that he was no farther altered from what he was five-and-twenty years ago, than every man naturally must be by the lapse of so many years, and that whatever alteration had taken place in him was for the better, for that his understanding was strengthened, and his knowledge increased. But he was no longer a novelty; his discourses had ceased to be stimulating; he could no longer amuse his flock with the dramatism of devotion. Their imaginations were no longer excited, their ears were not tickled, so they fancied that their devotion was growing cool, through lack of zeal on the part of their minister. Therefore they began to find fault with him, to send him anonymous letters, to accuse him of want of orthodoxy; in a word, they were tired of him, even though he had been their own voluntary and cheerful choice. They had nothing substantially serious to allege against him, so all their charges were of course of the most indefinite and shadowy nature; and because he was not sufficiently eloquent in the pulpit for their amusement, they were more than sufficiently eloquent against him out of the pulpit. The charges brought against him were of the most frivolous kind. Who would imagine, for instance, that a charge of Sabbath-breaking should be brought against a man because he was seen to put a letter in the post on Sunday evening? Some went so far as to say that he had been even known to read a newspaper on the Sabbath-day. His conduct was watched and commented upon in its minutest movements; all manner of idle tales were circulated concerning him, and every endeavour was made use of to bring him into contempt with the people of the town who were not of his flock, and who had no connexion with him whatever, but who had generally held him in estimation, because they thought that he was generally estimable; and so he truly was, and so he actually would have been in any other situation than in that of a dissenting minister. I do not intend hereby to insinuate that the dissenters are essentially and constitutionally a more unreasonable set of people than any others in the world, but it is their peculiar, their voluntary system, that brings them into these perplexities.—Pp.121—124.

Dissenting congregations, in the choice of a minister, are not only influenced by the consideration of what he may be to themselves, but they have a view to the appearance which he may make in the eyes of the world; and so long as he is acceptable to them, they take care to extol him to their neighbours, and to speak of him as a model of all that is good in heart, and wise in understanding; but when they grow weary of him, and wish to get rid of him, they desire to be kept in countenance by their neighbours, and to vindicate themselves for their want to change; then they speak very slightly, and even accusingly of him, bringing against him, for want of some great charge, a great number of little charges, which, being exaggerated and dwelt upon, produce a great impression; and as a dissenting minister lives in great familiarity with his congregation, they know all his movements, and one or other individual is sure to be acquainted with his unguarded expressions and vain thoughts; and it must be a very wonderful man indeed, who, in the course of five-and-twenty years, should neither do or say any thing foolish or blame-worthy. Thus is a dissenting minister much in the power of his congregation, if they choose to use that power, and that they sometimes do use it, I know for a fact.—Pp. 125—127.

After this, our hero is *ordained*, for with dissenters this ceremony *follows*, and does not *precede*, the liberty of preaching.

There is a difference between the ordination of clergymen, and the ordination of dissenting ministers. Clergymen are ordained by bishops, but dissenting ministers are ordained by one another. Clergymen are ordained before they commence their ministerial duties; dissenting ministers, not till they have a call from some congregation; and their ordination is by two or three ministers, chosen by themselves and their congregation. The difficulty in my case was this:—the neighbouring ministers, who were the most natural and proper persons to officiate at the ordination, thought that the minister from whom the secession had taken place, had not been fairly and honourably treated, and they were rather shy of countenancing the secession, yet they were rather afraid of speaking too strongly and too decidedly on the matter, because they had an instinct which told them that it would be very imprudent in them to countenance any rebellion of ministers against their people; therefore they abstained from joining in my ordination, under pretence of personal acquaintance with the deserted minister. In time, however, and after some trouble, four ministers were found, who consented to co-operate in my ordination. One of them prayed the ordination prayer, another asked me various questions concerning my faith, another gave me a solemn charge as to my ministerial duties, and the fourth preached to the people, telling them their duty. It was a very solemn and affecting service, and we afterwards all dined together at a public-house.—Pp. 130—132.

After the ordination another difficulty arose,—it was to be paid for. Our dinner at the public-house cost something, and as the four ordaining ministers came from a considerable distance, the expenses of their journey were to be paid. Hitherto not a word had been said about my salary, but as I was a single man, it was intimated that a small salary would suffice. When, however, the expenses of the ordination were deducted from the funds of the society, the treasurer's account had a very ugly look, and the difficulty was how to make it look handsomer. They had been at a great expense in hiring and fitting up the room, and they began to talk to me as the proprietor of the magazine did, about "up-hill work." Alack-a-day! I began to fear that it would be presently down-hill work. At length, after much talking, arrangement, and discussion, it was resolved that my salary should be sixty pounds for the first year, and afterwards to increase as the congregation should increase; so it should seem that my success was to depend much on my own exertions. Well, now, this seems plausible enough, and mightily ingenious is the arrangement; for under the idea that things are to be improved by diligence, the young man exerts all

his strength, exhausts his originality and his eloquence, gives the best of his services for sixty pounds a-year, and then what are the dregs of his mind worth?—Pp. 132, 133.

Every nerve is, however, strained, and a chapel is built for the author, who sets out on a journey, outside the stage-coach, and on foot, to collect subscriptions for it; and after six weeks' apostolic wandering, he returns home with 74*l.* 6*s.*, from which he has to deduct 6*l.* 6*s.* for travelling expenses!

He removes to L——, where his salary was 130*l.* per annum; but troubles beset him here also. A quarrel ensues between two of his flock.

The parties concerned were two of the fair sex; they were sisters; the one was the wife of my opulent and corpulent friend, the corn-factor, and the other was the widow of a very respectable grocer and tea-dealer. They were both members of my chapel, and both used to attend very regularly; but they were both of them so highly conscientious, that they would never both at the same time partake of the Lord's Supper. I had a great deal of trouble with them; indeed more than any one would readily believe, or could easily imagine. In the first instance, as soon as I was so far in their confidence as to know of the very existence of their disagreement, from that very hour I could never enter the house of either party without having the subject, not merely alluded to, but made the whole topic of conversation all the time that I staid. The first salutation was scarcely over before I was asked, "Did you see Mrs.—— at chapel on Sunday?" "Did you observe what a look she gave me as we were going out?" "Did you see what a frightful bonnet she had on?" "Did you notice how unbecoming her new silk gown looked?" To a thousand such questions from both parties I had to listen with exemplary patience, and to make to them something of a reply, trembling all the while lest my reply should be misinterpreted and misrepresented to the other. It was in vain for me to protest that I was not much in the habit of looking about me from the pulpit; it was in vain for me to declare that I was no judge of the pattern of bonnets, or the cut of silk gowns, for it was insisted on without mercy, that it was absolutely impossible that a gentleman of my superior understanding and classical attainments should not be able to discriminate between a well-made and an ill-made bonnet. Another great difficulty I had, which indeed amounted to an impossibility, and that was to ascertain what was the cause of the disagreement; but the very attempt to find it out was as hopeless and laborious a task as attempting to discover the source of the Niger. Indeed, my real opinion is, that they had been so long at enmity, that they themselves had actually forgotten the cause of the alienation. As a good physician, before he attempts to cure a complaint, endeavours to assure himself what the complaint really is, so did I endeavour to ascertain what the disagreement was, in order to set it to rights. My endeavours were fruitless. But if I had difficulty to discover which of the two was in the right, it was easy enough to see that both were in the wrong; for when I suggested the probability, and offered my mediation for the purpose of effecting a reconciliation, they did both severally, but with equal violence, exclaim against the possibility of such a thing, throwing of course all the blame the one upon the other, and *vice versa*.—Pp. 170—172.

We take a description he gives of *Unitarians*, as too good to be passed over unnoticed.

And now that I am on the subject, I know not why I may not, by way of instructive digression, say a few more words, which may give to the public a

knowledge of what is more talked about than understood. In London there are many Unitarians, but they are scarcely seen, for they are not sufficiently numerous to make much of an impression, or to fill up any great space in the religious world, and their peculiar features are not very distinguishable. Amongst Unitarians, as well as amongst all other sects, there must be of course a great moral variety, therefore the remarks which I am about to make must not be taken as applicable to every individual in the sect, but merely as generally descriptive. The most obvious feature in Unitarianism is, that its faith is rather negative than positive; and if any one ask what are the opinions of the Unitarians on religious topics, the truest and most compendious answer is, that they reject almost all the doctrines which the rest of the Christian world receive. They do indeed profess to acknowledge the divine authority of the New Testament, but as they do not admit the doctrine of the inspiration of the writers of the several books, they go very near to reduce the divine to a mere human authority. They talk of the evangelists and apostles writing as mere honest men and credible witnesses, according to the best of their judgment and ability; so that, after all, the Unitarian's divine authority of the New Testament does not amount to much more than the divine authority of Hume's History of England. They speak of Jesus Christ as an inspired teacher, but as for any idea of the blood of Christ cleansing from all sin, their explanation of it is such as to represent the blood of the apostles and martyrs equally efficacious for that purpose. Their first process in order to get rid of the texts obnoxious to their theory, is to call them interpolations, but where that cannot be very decently done, then they are called strong oriental figures; but if all that will not do, then, as the apostles were fallible men, it is possible that they might have been in error sometimes; and of course, they must have been wrong when they contradict the modern Unitarian theory. I have been frequently led by curiosity to hear their preachers, and I think I have not unfairly stated their peculiar theology and criticism. Their congregations are not very numerous, and their chapels are but thinly attended, except now and then in the case of some peculiarly eloquent preacher, and then the audience is got together rather to hear man's eloquence, than to attend upon the worship of God. Those of their sermons which I have heard, are either meagre talkings upon some common-places of morals or sophistical underminings of some doctrine of the gospel. They seem, generally speaking, to have but light ideas of sin, regarding rather its physical and temporal inconvenience, than its moral enormity or future consequences. The general effect of their preaching seems to be to produce a habit of scoffing at things sacred, and they frequently make a joke of those matters which, being above their comprehension, they think to be contrary to reason, though I question whether many of them know what reason is. The difference between Unitarianism and infidelity is so slight, that men pass from one to the other, without their neighbours being sensible of it. Considering how lightly, for the most part, they regard religion, I almost wonder that they take so much pains to make proselytes; but they are always boasting of the increase of their numbers; their proselytes, however, are not made by converting the irreligious to religion, but by bringing men over from one opinion to another. They boast of opening new chapels, but they say not a word of those that they shut up for want of hearers.—Pp. 187—190.

Our quotations have been so ample, that we ought not to intrude them further on our readers; but, as perfect in its kind, we must not omit the following sample of the way in which the *Voluntaries* consider themselves at liberty to interfere with their pastors.

Not long after the subsidence of the discord above-named, and when I was congratulating myself that now all things were proceeding smoothly, I was assailed by the means of anonymous letters, an instrument of annoyance to

which dissenting ministers are particularly subject; and perhaps also other persons may be so too, only we are always apt to magnify what concerns ourselves. It is only necessary here to premise, that I had now been married seven years, and that my family consisted of three children; the eldest a girl about six years of age; the second a boy about four, and the youngest not more than twelve months. My wife also was living, and a very excellent wife she was, and I may add, is still. I shall give these anonymous letters at full length, not altering the spelling, nor correcting the language; for there is a raciness and pungency in the original style which correction would only destroy. The first concerns the management of my family.

“Reverend Sir:

“It is with the most *sincerest pane* that I now take up my penn at this Time to *address* you on a matter of INFINIT momunt. I know sir that your a man of grate learnin and much skollarship, and therfor p’raps my feeble penn ought not to *presuem* to approche you without the UTMOST REFERENCE. You may believe me when I tell you that there is no man whos preachin givs me more *instruction* nor yours, nevertheless, *most reverend sir*, I must tak the LIBERTY to say with all due DIFFERENCE to your *superier* JUGEMENT to say, I say, that your children is not mannaged with all that propriety which ought to be the *undoulted distinction* of evvery minister who proflases to teach his people *in the way* of truth, has *reveiled* in the Gosples of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins. Miss Angelina was FARST ASLEPE last Sunday afternoon almost all sermon time, and SNORED so as to be heered all over the meetin, and Master Tommy plays at marvels in the streets. if so be then as how you values the *immortle soles* of your children why dont you bring them up in the nurtur and ammunition of the Lord. So no more at present from your loving freind who shall be

“Annonimus.”

Scarcely had I recovered from the shock which the above letter gave me, when another was put in my hand, coming from nobody knows where, and bringing against me another heavy charge. It was as follows:—

“Reverend Sir:

“I have set under your ministry some yeres listening with greate delite to the tidings of the everlasting gosples, but am sorrey to say that of late I have not profitted as I yoused to do. I have ben a little afrade that the fault might be in myself, but on the closest examination I have come to the conclusion that you do not preach the gosples as you did once when you furst come among us. Our souls are parch up for want of the truth, the due of the word does not dissend upon us to fertilize our harts, and make them fruteful. A report is got abroad from some quarter or other, that you are half a sossinion at bottom, only you don’t speak out. Your preaching does not awaken the conscins as it out to do. unles these things is greatly altered you cant expect your people to profet by the word preched

“Your faithfl freind—Alliquis.”

Pp. 200—203.

It is thus our author concludes his reminiscences of ———.

I have thought much of this matter, and have observed it long with great patience and a close attention, and I find it to be an evil inseparable from dissent, and the natural consequence of the voluntary system. A minister goes to a congregation as a suppliant; he must make himself agreeable to all, and undergo the criticisms of all; the very outset of his connexion with them places him in a humiliating attitude. When he first enters the pulpit as a candidate, the question naturally occurs to him, “Do I seek to please men?” and the answer as naturally occurs to him in the affirmative; for awhile, perhaps, he



may succeed ; may be intensely popular ; may be idolized ; but it cannot last long, unless he has extraordinary talents or great comparative wealth. Few men of wealth, however, are disposed to take up the work of the ministry among the dissenters ; and as for extraordinary talents, it is merely an identical proposition to say that they are not common. But let a man's wealth or talents be what they may, a dissenting congregation can never forget that it has sat in judgment on its minister, and therefore can never look up with complete respect to one on whom it has looked down with the investigation of criticism. It often happens that a minister is engaged for six months, or even more, upon trial, and during the whole of that time he is listened to critically ; and he preaches and prays with a view to criticism ; and he is compelled to undergo a thousand impertinent hints, animadversions, and suggestions, to make himself all things to all men ; and at last it depends on the turn of a straw whether he be chosen or rejected. The sanctity and reverence of the ministerial character must greatly suffer by this system ; and accordingly we find almost every where that a dissenting minister is but the tool of his flock ; they are his instructor, and not he theirs. He must preach and pray in such fashion as may be most pleasing to them ; he must be always of their opinion in all matters, religious, political, or otherwise —Pp. 211—213.

And thus he concludes the work itself :—

I now hasten to bring my memoirs to a close,—at least for the present ; for I am looking back to the period of which I am now writing through a vista of some years. Should the preceding pages interest the public, I may resume my pen, though I have my doubts ; for I am growing old, and writing is a labour to me. Suffice it now to say, that through the means of that same friend by whom I was introduced to the congregation at Z—, I was introduced to another, where I still am ; and with which, perhaps, I may close my days. I am now labouring in rather a humble station,—in a small village ; and as the greater part of my small flock are elderly people, they do not care much about novelty. Whatever farther memorials I might now, in my days of garrulity, set down on paper, would be more of reflection, and of sketches of character, than of personal history. In the above, I can assure the reader, that I have not been prompted by any feeling of resentment, or of irritation ; I have merely set forth the evils of a system, and I do not see how it can be mended. Then why, it may be said, do I send forth these observations to the world ? I will tell the reader why :—I send them forth in order that dissenters, seeing the evils which their system induces, may be as much as possible on their guard against them ; and that they may not seek to extend, and to make general, a system which never can work well.—Pp. 226, 227.

The above extracts would furnish us with excellent grounds for much instructive reasoning and illustration respecting the evils of the voluntary system. But our purpose has been to say little, and to leave the work to speak for itself and us ; and we are assured, that no stronger arguments can be adduced than the graphic sketches of our excellent delineator of *Dissent* as it is.

---

## LITERARY REPORT.

**מִדְּשׁ מִלִּים**. *An English and Hebrew Lexicon. To which is added, a Selection of Proper Names occurring in Scripture and in the Rabbinical Writings.* By MICHAEL JOSEPHS. London: Wertheim; Hatchards: Richardson. 1834. Pp. xiv. 371.

A WORK exceedingly well adapted for its object, the facilitation of Hebrew composition. This is an art of which the utility is not immediately manifest, but is very capable of demonstration. A thoroughly critical knowledge of any language can only be possessed by one who can compose in it. Hebrew composition is required for scholarships; and the Hebrew student will find his comprehension of the language considerably extended, by simply translating a book of the English Bible into Hebrew. The great difficulty in this case is to procure a vocabulary; and this Mr. Josephs has afforded. We recommend the book to Hebrew students in general as a valuable aid, and wish every success to the philological labours of Mr. Josephs.

*Helps to Hebrew. In Two Parts.* By A TEACHER. London: Wertheim. Pp. ii. 33.

By the Rev. T. Boys, of Pentonville, and very good. The first part contains all that is necessary for the Hebrew student to learn by rote, except the verbs. The second consists of some excellent Hebrew exercises. It is a very suitable and valuable companion to the work we have noticed above.

*A Series of Charts delineating the Rise and Progress of the Evangelical or Christian Dispensation, from the commencement of the Gospel Narrative to the Ascension of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. From Mimpriss's Pictorial Chart.* London: Wertheim. 1834.

A VERY interesting and useful accompaniment to a very valuable work. It consists of tabular blank columns, to be filled up with the "No.," "Event," "Place," and "Evangelist," according to the arrangement of Mr. Mimpriss's map. Opposite to these is a skeleton map, to which references are to be made. A blank page is left on the back of each table, for a summary of the history detailed in it. Copies are also printed in the colours of the map, for those who wish to comment more at length. Nothing can be more complete. Perhaps, the very best way of becoming clearly and methodically acquainted with the chronology and succession of the events of our Lord's life, is by "working out" the series of charts. The thanks of the Christian, the historian, and the friend of youth, are eminently due to Mr. Mimpriss.

*A Vindication of the Right of the Bishops to Sit and Vote in the House of Peers.* By the Rev. PETER HEYLIN, D.D. *With Introductory Remarks on the Features of the present Time, as compared with those of the period just preceding the Civil Wars in England.* By the EDITOR. London: Pickering; Whittaker. 1835. 8vo. Pp. xxxi. 28.

WHOEVER the Editor of this work may be, he is both a talented and able champion in the cause of truth and right. His introductory remarks to Heylin's invaluable tract should be universally read by all who love their Church and the good order of society, as demonstrating the sad parallel between present and past times, and as an incentive to us all to stem, as far as in us lieth, the licentious spirit which so pervades our nation. The Editor has our sincere thanks for his labours.



*An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; with a Short Account of the English Translations of the Bible, and of the Liturgy of the Church of England.* By G. TOMLINE, D.D. late Lord Bishop of Winchester. To which are added, Notes and a Series of Questions, by the Rev. R. B. PAUL, late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. Oxford: Vincent. 1835. Small 8vo.

THE additional notes, together with the questions appended to each article of this well-known work, render it particularly valuable to the student in divinity, and will be likely also to effect one great design of the Rev. Editor, viz. that "his young fellow-christians shall be induced to examine narrowly the doctrines of that Church to which they profess to belong, so as to be able to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them."

*Passion Week: a Devotional and Practical Exposition of the Epistles and Gospels appointed for that Season, adapted for the Closet and the Family.* By the Rev. ROBERT MEEK. London: Hatchard. 1835. Pp. xi. 187. 12mo.

MR. MEEK commenced his career as a clerical author by the publication of his "Reasons for Attachment and Conformity to the Church of England," now in their second edition. These "Reasons" were followed up by his more elaborate treatise, entitled "The Church of England a faithful Witness against the Errors and Corruptions of the Church of Rome." Having thus guarded the members of our Church, on the one hand, against the insinuations and attacks of dissent, and on the other, against the soul-destroying tenets of popery, he has, in the present work, endeavoured to "build them up in their most holy faith," by producing a series of Meditations on the Epistles and Gospels appointed to be read during Passion Week. They are, what they profess to be, strictly "devotional and practical:" and we cheerfully

recommend them to our readers, as being equally adapted to the closet and to reading in the family. We hope that the reception given to them will be such as to encourage him to proceed with his announced similar exposition of the whole of the appointed epistles and gospels, as read in the Church of England.

*Oriental Illustrations of the Scriptures, collected from the Customs, Manners, Rites, Superstitions, and Traditions, Parabolical, Idiomatical, and Proverbial Forms of Speech, Climate, Works of Art, and Literature of the Hindoos, during a residence of nearly fourteen years.* By JAMES ROBERTS, Corresponding Member of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain. London: Murray. 1835. Pp. xxiv. 619.

THE application of Hindoo manners, customs, and allusions, to the illustration of the Holy Scriptures, is comparatively recent. Mr. Ward, at the end of the second volume of his profound work on the History and Theology of the Hindoos, (published about eighteen years since,) gave thirty pages of such elucidations. In 1827, Mr. Callaway furnished numerous additions to Mr. Ward's Researches, from the usages of the Ceylonese, in a small duodecimo volume of "Oriental Observations and occasional Criticisms." It was, however, reserved for Mr. Roberts to produce original illustrations of nearly thirteen hundred important passages of the Holy Scriptures from the Hindoo sources mentioned in his title-page. They are the result of nearly fourteen years' close observation of the manners, &c. &c. of the Hindoos; and they reflect great credit on his industry and research. The remarks are disposed in the order of the books, chapters, and verses of the Bible, and are equally curious and instructive. Very many difficult passages of the Old Testament, in particular, are here happily elucidated. Future commentators may derive much valuable information from this beautifully printed volume, the value of which is enhanced by two copious indexes of texts and of the subjects; a sort of literary furniture

which we should be glad to see more frequently introduced into modern publications, instead of the meagre tables of contents which are too frequently prefixed to them.

*An Authentic Account of our Authorized Translation of the Holy Bible, and of the Translators; with Testimonies to the excellence of the Translation: collected by the Rev. H. J. TODD, M.A. Second Edition.* Malton: Smithson. London: Rivingtons. 18mo. Pp. 68.

A LITTLE work, but full of the most pleasing information as connected with the translation of our Bible. It will form a useful addition to the clerical library: and to the general reader, it offers a "distinct account how the translators were fully prepared, and in no respect deficient, to the good work they undertook." The biographical notices are very instructive; and the volume has our warm commendation.

*The National Church a National Treasure; or the Excellencies of the Scottish Ecclesiastical Establishment delineated; being the substance of a Sermon delivered in the High Church of Edinburgh, on the 11th November, 1834, at the opening of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale.* With an Appendix, containing copious Notes and Illustrations, in which the Religious State of America is particularly brought forward as the result of personal observation. By GEORGE BURNS, D.D. Minister of the Parish of Tweedsmuir, late Moderator of Synod. Edinburgh: W. Whyte & Co. Booksellers to Her Majesty. Glasgow: W. Collins and M. Ogle. Perth: J. Dewar. Aberdeen: A. Brown & Co. 1835.

THIS is an able and well written Sermon on the advantages derived from ecclesiastical establishments: but as it is particularly adapted to the national Church in Scotland, we do not deem it so necessary to give extracts from the Sermon itself. The information, however, which Dr. Burns has furnished from his own observations, on

the religious state of America, is so important, as coming from an unprejudiced eye-witness, that we cannot forego the opportunity of extracting the following particulars, by way of supplement to the facts and statements given in our last Number, Pp. 141, 142.

But is church accommodation provided in America, in proportion to the increase of population, or the real necessities of the people? By no means. No such principle of supply has as yet come into operation, for this very obvious reason, that what is every body's business is nobody's, and the spiritual good of the multitudes living in a state of heathenism in the finest of her cities, is left to the casual regards of well-meaning Christians, or the mercenary services of a *ministerium vagum*, in its most unseemly form. Places of worship are not erected in the localities where most required because teeming with a population at once poor and ignorant, demoralized and wretched, but where a spirit of party may have occasioned divisions in pre-existing congregations, or where a spiritual empiric may think he has a chance of making a profitable lodgment, to say nothing of the impetus applied to shrewd and calculating worldlings by the sanguine hope of making a lucrative speculation. Whilst such principles are acted on, it is not to be expected that the scattered settlements throughout the vast interminable forests should find either "nursing fathers, or nursing mothers," in as far as "saving health" is concerned. If they have any ministry at all, it is in general neither of a regular nor useful character, and seldom indeed can a backwoods-man of the west be said to "smile when a sabbath appears," for, alas! there is nothing to mark its approach—around his humble dwelling it casts no blissful radiance.—Even in the most favourable circumstances, where the population is dense, and the sacred edifices are both commodious and elegant, a *minister* is too often viewed as a secondary object, and an occasional passenger, who will be contented with a trifle of pecuniary remuneration, is all that is expected to conduct the public devotions of the sanctuary. To rear even a handsome wooden structure is comparatively an easy task—one giving ground, another furnishing materials, and a third contributing personal labour, and there the matter is at an end; but to be liable for the permanent support of a resident minister is quite a dif-

ferent thing; such a burden is not rashly taken upon them; and when, in particular circumstances, it has been assumed, it is thrown off with little ceremony as soon as the limited period of engagement expires, in virtue of that power of dismissal which is usually retained in the hands of the managers, and too often exercised on the most frivolous pretences. What would be thought in Scotland of a worthy minister being set adrift, merely because a man was employed to open and shut his vestry or pulpit door? and yet, such was the fate, a few years ago, of a respectable Episcopal Clergyman, in an enlightened city of America, it being conceived by his more pious and influential hearers, that he thus betrayed a spirit inconsistent with that becoming in a servant of the lowly Jesus! While such is the mode of procedure, how is a permanent, or efficient, or respectable ministry to be secured for any people? If ministers of the gospel are to be regarded by their employers as mere hirelings, and as such to be subjected to the most degrading surveillance, must it not operate greatly to discourage respectable parents from training their sons, by means of an expensive education, for such a profession? And if a church is not provided with a constant succession of qualified clergy, how is the cause of religion to prosper within its pale? To such causes may be traced the low standard of ministerial talent and character which admits, even in such cities as New York, persons of the humblest pretensions as laymen in this country, to acquire a status, (on reaching that land of free and open competition,) equal to that of any minister in our metropolis, either within or without the Establishment, and that too without study, and without probation. On crossing the line of demarcation between British and American territory one of the first things that naturally strikes a member, either of the Anglican or Scottish Church, is the elevated position occupied by Unitarians, as evinced not only by the splendour of their churches, the extent, the wealth, and influence of their congregations; but also, by the control which they possess over some of the most important seminaries of education, such as Harvard University at Cambridge, near Boston; where an attempt was lately made to secure their complete and permanent ascendancy—a consummation which they had very nearly effected. And so little is a divine of either of the British Establishments accustomed to meet with persons in this or the neighbouring section of the island, who openly

call in question the peculiar doctrines of revelation, that he feels not a little surprised and shocked, to witness in the higher and best informed circles of America, a spirit of bold and determined scepticism, on those points which distinguish revealed from natural religion, together with a disposition to depreciate the understandings of all such as adhere to churches which have these for their credenda. *This comes of being left free from the trammels of creeds and confessions, of having no system of doctrine drawn up from the inspired records, in the knowledge and belief of which the youth of the country are trained, of leaving every public and private individual to cull from the Bible what suits his own preconceived opinions; in short, of a national government requiring no test of faith in a single doctrine peculiar to revelation on the part of any functionary, either sacred or civil.* "Oh!" said a venerable Presbyterian divine in Philadelphia, to the writer of these pages, "you live in a happy country, where the true religion has got the imprimatur of the state—here, where my lot is cast, a synagogue of Satan would just have as much favour from the powers that be, as the purest church in the whole land!"—Pp. 38—40.

---

*Church and Home Melodies, being a New Version of the more devotional parts of the Psalms, together with a Version of the Collects, and Original Hymns for Congregational and Domestic Purposes. By the Rev. THOMAS JAMES JUDKIN, M.A.*  
 London: Hatchard & Son. 1834.  
 Pp. 659.

WE receive this volume as another proof of the general and increasing interest which is felt on the subject of Church Psalmody. Impressed as we are with the importance of congregational singing, and convinced that singing will never be truly congregational, until the people shall be furnished with psalms and hymns which they can dwell upon in their hours of retirement and meditation, we hail whatever may advance so desirable an object.

The volume before us contains nearly 600 originals. If it be censure to say that few of them reach our standard, that censure must be extended to most of the productions of our most popular and approved writers of hymns. After

having laboured through more than a hundred volumes of psalms and hymns, original and selected, we are compelled to declare, that in no department of our literature is there so much that is bad, so little that is truly excellent. If we were to class our volumes in the order of their respective merits, Mr. Judkin's would not have a low place. We offer the following as specimens.

## PSALM 121.

Up to the hills I lift mine eyes,  
 From whence alone in streams descend  
 Those free and bountiful supplies,  
 Which neither measure know nor end.  
 They flow from Thee, whose word hath  
 made  
 Heav'n's boundless heights, earth's  
 spacious plains,  
 Whose eyes no slumbers may invade,  
 Whose strength thy people's course  
 maintains.  
 Thou art our guardian ; nor by day  
 Shall smite the sun's intenser light,  
 Nor yet the moon with sickly ray  
 Shed baleful influence o'er our night.  
 Thy grace preserves the soul from sin,  
 Thy Spirit shall to health restore ;  
 Our goings-out, and comings-in,  
 Thou blessest now and evermore.  
 P. 155.

## COLLECT FOR GOOD FRIDAY.

O Lord, in pray'r before thy throne  
 We meekly bow the knee,  
 That thou with pitying love mayst own  
 Thy human family.  
 For whom, by heav'nly mercy sent,  
 Of glory disarray'd,  
 Thy blessed Son, in meek content,  
 Came forth to be betray'd ;  
 And all-resign'd and yielding now,  
 The pure and wise and good  
 Saw from the cross, with bleeding brow,  
 The mocking multitude :

But having crush'd sin's rebel host,  
 And seiz'd death's tyrant rod,  
 With thee and with the Holy Ghost  
 Reigns one eternal God.

P. 224.

## CHRISTMAS.

A multitude of the heavenly host praising God.  
 LUKE ii. 13.

There's music in the heav'n amid the  
 stillness of the night,  
 While shepherds are abiding yet, to  
 watch their fleecy care ;  
 The clouds are rolling rapidly, and in  
 the bursting light,  
 Togolden harps are carolling the angels  
 bright and fair.  
 Oh ! listen to the choral song which hails  
 a Saviour's birth,  
 That fills those humble watchers' hearts  
 with wonder and with love,  
 " Good tidings of great joyfulness to all  
 who dwell on earth,  
 " And glory in the highest be, to  
 God enthron'd above !"  
 The world that had been travailing so  
 long in pain and woe,  
 Hath heard amidst its guilty fears a  
 voice which soothes to rest ;  
 And God the Father's gracious face, with  
 cloud obscur'd till now,  
 Shines through the image of his Son,  
 the blessing and the blest.  
 With the music of the angels be the  
 music of my heart,  
 And let the shepherds' gratitude my  
 ev'ry power inflame ;  
 And with the anthems of the church, my  
 soul, bear thou thy part,  
 For all thy mercies shown to thee in  
 Christ's redeeming name.

P. 501.

The volume is dedicated, by per-  
 mission, to the good and venerable  
 Bishop of Salisbury.

## A SERMON,

FOR THE SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE EASTER DAY.—MORNING.

MATTHEW XXVI. 14—16.

*Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him.*

THIS passage brings to our notice one of the most extraordinary, and, perhaps I may add, one of the most melancholy, circumstances of the gospel history—the treachery of one of our Lord's twelve chosen disciples. It had been, indeed, decreed in the eternal counsels of God, that Christ should be betrayed to his enemies, and die for mankind. Our Lord had himself foreseen and foretold that these things should come to pass. He knew, even from the beginning, who should betray him. But that the traitor should have been found amongst his own favoured companions, is in truth a sad, as well as an amazing consideration.

But why, and how, was this act of treachery accomplished? It appears that the chief priests and scribes had already met together in council to consider by what means they might best bring Jesus into their power to put him to death. They had decided, moreover, that it would be expedient not to attempt this till after the Passover, which was near at hand, because they feared the people, of whom great multitudes came up to Jerusalem for the feast, might interfere in his behalf. (Ver. 5.) Having, then, come to this decision, what must have been their astonishment, when they saw “one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot,” coming to them, as it seems, unasked, and proposing to make agreement with them to place his Master in their hands! But we must recollect that this Judas—his surname of Iscariot is added to distinguish him from another Judas or Jude, who was also one of the twelve—this Judas Iscariot was from the first a bad man. This our Lord well knew, and had known all along. It is expressly said in one passage of Scripture, that he “was a devil,” (John vi. 70,) that is, was wholly under the influence of the evil spirit; and in another passage, that he “was a thief.” (John xii. 6.) The fact was, Judas had resigned himself to the seductions and dominion of Satan; and the consequence seems to have been, that under his guidance, covetousness had become the ruling passion of his heart. The love of money—the desire of gain, had obtained full possession of his soul. No doubt, he had first attached himself to our Lord, and afterwards continued with him, in the hope of gratifying this his ruling passion. It is, indeed, particularly mentioned, that he carried the bag or purse which contained such money as belonged to our Lord and his disciples; and thus had secured an opportunity of continually taking money therefrom. But this was not all. He hoped, no doubt, that his Lord would in time throw off his great humility, and

invest himself—as the Jews expected the Messiah to come—with all the magnificence of temporal and worldly power; and that then he, as one of his chief followers, would himself be promoted and enriched. But now, perhaps, he began to doubt on the subject; and consequently was not unwilling to take advantage of another means of enriching himself. Besides, we find it mentioned in this same chapter, that our Lord had, a little before, thought it right decidedly to condemn the views of the twelve disciples in general, and those of Judas in particular, respecting the woman who poured the alabaster box of ointment on his head as he sat at meat. And this, perhaps, had especially angered and offended Judas Iscariot, and led him in his anger to think of betraying his Master. It is, at all events remarkable, that St. Matthew here tells us of that which happened respecting the woman a little out of time, for it really occurred a few days before;—and then relates, in the words of my text, that “Judas went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you?”

Be this however as it may, we can scarcely imagine the amazement and joy of the Jewish council when Judas came to them. But we may conceive their readiness to accept such a desirable and unexpected offer of assistance in the accomplishment of their wicked work. They now made no more mention of delaying their attempt till after the Passover was passed. No! they appear immediately to have “covenanted,” or agreed “with him, for thirty pieces of silver.” But is it possible that he accepted such terms as these? For thirty pieces of silver! that is, for about three pounds fifteen shillings of our money, at the utmost! Yes, he did accept them; and for this trifling sum, the price of the redemption of a slave, (Exod. xxi. 32,) he agreed to betray his Master! It is possible, he might not know, or even suspect, that they wished, or intended to put him to death. But he must have known their general character, and also that they had continually shewn themselves his most bitter and deadly enemies; and consequently, he could not possibly calculate to what extent they might carry their enmity.

In accounting for the treachery of Judas, other reasons have been proposed for his conduct. He has been supposed to have undertaken the work in order to force his Master to declare himself as the Messiah he expected. But I know not that the Scriptures give any ground for this. And depend upon it, the prevailing passion spoken of in Scripture as actuating this wicked man,—I mean his covetousness,—is amply sufficient to account for his conduct. We know little of the nature of covetous people, if we do not know that they will do almost any thing for the sake of money. The sum of money—thirty pieces of silver—may, indeed, appear small, and so it was when considered as the price of blood, and would not probably have tempted a rich man. But we must recollect that Judas was not in a situation to be accustomed to large sums. Besides, we know very well, that when the love of money is once become the ruling passion in a man, he will readily take even a small sum, if he cannot easily obtain a larger.

Having thus agreed to the sum, Judas entered at once on his iniquitous undertaking. “And from that time he sought opportunity to betray” his Master unto them. O, conceive the baseness of the man!

Behold him watching hourly for some favourable occasion for placing him, whom he had so constantly followed for so considerable a length of time, in the hands of his most bitter and inveterate enemies!

Now, in considering this history as a subject for instruction on the present occasion, I shall proceed to refer to several points. And,

1. The first point to which I would direct your attention is, the decided proof it gives us of the truth of the gospel account of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. And this it does in two ways.

(1.) In the first place, the Scriptures declare that our blessed Lord was wholly without sin, and devoid of guile. And this account of the character and conduct of Judas confirms these declarations in a most striking and decided manner. Because, if there had been the least deceit in any thing connected with our blessed Saviour, this wicked Judas would certainly have discovered it, and, of course, would long before have made it known to his enemies, the high priests, to make a gain by his information. If there could have been traced out the slightest degree of evil or deceit in his life, or in his miracles, or indeed in any one point, we may be sure this treacherous and covetous disciple would have taken advantage of it for the advancement of his own unholy profit. This Judas, we must recollect, had been with our Lord all along; had been with him in private as well as in public; in his secret retirements and in the world; he had seen his miracles, he had heard his discourses at home and abroad, yet up to this time his enemies had clearly never received any such testimony against Jesus. And why was this? Not because Judas would have been unwilling to have made use of such a means of enriching himself; neither because the chief priests and scribes would have refused to have received such intelligence; for it is but too clear that Judas would most gladly have betrayed what he knew, and they, eager as they ever were from the first to find an opportunity to accuse our Lord, would as gladly have covenanted with Judas for money to make him do so. No: the real reason must be found elsewhere,—in the fact that there was, in truth, nothing to betray. Jesus, as the sacred history declares to us, “knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.”

(2.) The other way in which this history respecting Judas tends to prove the truth of the gospel accounts of our blessed Lord is this. It confirms very strongly the truth-telling spirit of the sacred writers, and that of St. Matthew in particular, who was one of the twelve, and, consequently, the constant companion of Judas. For, suppose a person were to sit down to write the history of a false Christ or false prophet,—the history of a mere pretender or impostor in religion,—do you think he would make any, or at least much mention of the failings, or errors, or crimes of his chosen disciples and more immediate followers? If he were putting together a story respecting a prophet or teacher who never existed, but whom he wished to persuade you really did once exist, he would be much more likely to describe his followers as becoming, under his instruction, the most perfect of human beings; and at all events, he would say little respecting any faults or vices in describing their characters. But this we see was not the course pursued by the writers of the Gospels. They do, indeed, describe their Master as perfect,—as altogether without sin, which indeed he really



was; and they tell us the reason why he was so;—that is to say, because he was more than man—because he was, in fact, God as well as man. But of themselves, they speak not merely as of men corrupt and fallen by nature, but as of men guilty in a very remarkable degree. They speak of their own failings, faults, and crimes, in a manner which places on their accounts the stamp of candour, fairness, and truth. They not only tell us of all our Lord's chosen disciples forsaking him in a most ignominious manner, and of one of them thrice denying him, and refusing to acknowledge himself to have been his disciple;\* but they even relate, without disguise, that one of the twelve, whom he had selected and marked with his especial favour, actually betrayed him into the hands of his bitterest and most powerful enemies! Ought not this to go a great way to prove, that in *all* they wrote they spoke the truth? nay, that they spoke the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Surely it ought. Would that these points, and such as these, could have their merited weight on the mind of the infidel, and lead him to receive the gospel as the truth, and to believe in Christ to the salvation of his soul!

2. This history may lead us to expect that God will, for *wise* purposes we doubt not, allow wicked men to be found from time to time in the ministry of his church on earth. Judas, we must bear in mind, was "one of the twelve," one of the chosen ones of Christ; one of those whom he had called to be with him from the first; one, moreover, whom he had actually sent out to preach the gospel, and to work miracles in his name. The sacred writer mentions that the twelve were all sent out for these great purposes, and even speaks of Judas by name, as Judas Iscariot which betrayed him. (St. Matt. x. 1—5.) All these things, there can be no doubt, he must have actually performed: for otherwise, the other disciples would have suspected him of being the bad person he really was, which they clearly never did. Yet this Judas had a devil, and he was a thief. He was a wicked, unprincipled man. He first obeyed the call, and afterwards remained with the holy Jesus, as it seems, for the sake of the portion of this world's good which he hoped to obtain by these means. Nay, our blessed Lord even allowed him to retain the apostleship until, in the end, he covenanted for money to betray his Master. I think, then, we must not be surprised, if we find that when the number of ministers is multiplied, there may be some who are not such as becometh the gospel of Christ. If the apostles were but twelve, and one of them was a devil, surely we must never expect any church to be perfectly pure from evil ministers on this side heaven, and we must not be surprised, or too ready to condemn those in authority, if, in the pure and apostolic Church to which we belong, out of the eleven or twelve thousand ministers which are in it, we meet sometimes with a portion of them in any degree like Judas. What ought to be our course as Christians when we meet with such a case, is clear, if we would follow the 26th Article of our Church, which is to this effect:—"Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority

\* The conduct of Peter and the rest of the disciples, formed a Sermon for this Sunday in a former number of the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.



in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments; yet *forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission* and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith, and rightly, do receive the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men."

"Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty, by just judgment be deposed."

Such, then, is the course which every true member of the Church of England will pursue in such a case; and to this also, if he know the value of prayer for others, and remember how earnestly and repeatedly St. Paul required the prayers of the Christians to whom he wrote in behalf of himself and his fellow-ministers, he will never fail to offer up his supplications to the throne of grace for the clergy in general, and especially for the minister of his own parish, whoever he may be. He will continually pray, "that it may please God to illuminate (or enlighten) him with true knowledge and understanding of his Word, and that *both by his preaching and living*, he may set it forth and show it accordingly."\*

3. But the instruction which I would more especially desire you to derive from this history, and would endeavour to impress most deeply upon your minds, is of a somewhat more personal and practical character. Brethren, this history of Judas proves how insufficient it is merely to live within hearing of the truth as it is in Jesus. The hearing of the Word of God, even in all its full perfection, will never save us in the end, unless it have worked in us really good views and right feelings, and thus lead us on to a good life and a good hope. Many unbelieving and impenitent persons are apt to think, and perhaps even to say, "O, if I had heard Christ himself preach, and had seen him work miracles before my eyes, I should—I must, have believed on him, and have followed his ways." But would they, do you think, have done so? Look at Judas, and answer the question. Judas Iscariot heard all our Lord's heavenly discourses, his awakening warnings, his tremendous threatenings, his persuasive appeals and promises, but all in vain. He saw all his amazing miracles,—the blind restored to sight, the deaf made to hear, the dumb to speak, the lame to walk, and no doubt the dead raised again to life,—but all to no purpose. Nay, he had himself, we cannot question, preached and done many mighty works in his Lord's name, but all—all in vain. He remained hardened, impenitent; unbelieving, unholy. And so it is now with multitudes. They hear the truth, they see its mighty workings for good in those around them; nay, they sometimes assist in promoting the knowledge of the truth to the great benefit of others; but they do not receive the truth themselves. Whilst, perhaps, they are making much ado about the

\* In the Litany.

gospel being preached, or not being preached; whilst they make a bold and loud profession of knowing the truth themselves, thousands are yet as bad at heart, or nearly so, as Judas himself. All their hearing of the word of truth; all their talking of the gospel; all their scriptural knowledge, fail of their end, and become utterly useless. They are under the guidance of Satan, not under that of Christ; and if no change take place in them before they die, I fear, whatever they may appear to the world, they will go to those dreadful mansions of eternal misery prepared for the devil and his angels, in the midst of which Judas went to his own place.

4. But this history of Judas may also give us an especial warning against the indulgence of one evil passion in particular; I mean covetousness. The love of gain is indeed a most dangerous passion. The love of money has been well described as the "root of all evil," because there is no evil under the sun, which has not already arisen, and which may not again arise, from the influence of this fatal passion. When once a person allows covetousness to enter his heart, and to occupy a place there, he knows not where it may lead, or where it may end. Little, no doubt, did Judas intend or imagine, that in the event he would betray his Master for the sake of gratifying his love of money; yet in the end he did so. Let us remember, then, our Lord's words, when he said to his disciples, "Beware of covetousness." (St. Luke xii. 15.) Let us remember, also, that this warning is as necessary both for the poor as for the rich: for Judas, you may observe, was already a poor man, and for a very small sum he was tempted of Satan to betray his Lord and Master, to his own eternal ruin. And so it is with multitudes of our Lord's disciples now. Alas! alas! thousands, I fear, of poor as well as rich, consent to sell their souls for the sake of a little money.

In conclusion then, my brethren, let this history of Judas lead us all to value aright the opportunities we have of learning—whether it be by hearing or by reading the Word of God,—what is the truth as it is in Jesus. Let us take heed *how* we hear, and *how* we read, and ever bear in mind the necessity of profiting by these means of grace and salvation. Let us beware, lest in spite of all our spiritual advantages, we become, like Judas, gradually, day by day, more and more hardened in sin. Let us examine well what is the frame of mind in which we hear or read of the doctrines and precepts of the Bible. Let us consider what effect our hearing and reading has hitherto had on our heart and on our life. Let us pray to God, through Christ, that he will open our hearts to make us understand his Word. Let us be ready to receive the truth in the love thereof. Let us be willing to follow the Scriptures wherever they may lead us. May they lead us, with the help of the Holy Spirit, to a saving faith and a consistent practice! May they incline us readily to curb every feeling and desire, to resist every lust and affection, to renounce every habit and practice, and to resign every possession or pursuit, which may hinder us in running the race that is set before us! May they, moreover, raise us up from one degree of holiness to another, so that, continuing faithful unto death, we may obtain a crown of life, through the merits of Jesus Christ our blessed Lord and Saviour! Amen.

D. I. E.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## THE DISSENTERS' MARRIAGE BILL.

For the dissent which rests upon conscientious scruples, we entertain all the respect which sincerity, however weak and ignorant, is entitled always to claim; but for turbulent faction, under whatever name disguised, we have only profound contempt, and we rejoice whenever it brings upon itself deserved punishment and shame, by entangling itself in its own snares, and destroying itself by its own success.

If dissenters, as *they* say, are respectable and conscientious, they may exercise their new privilege with safety; but if, as we believe, their pretensions are of the lowest character; if their numbers are enormously overrated; if the bulk of them are dupes of leaders, whose one ruling principle is enmity to the Church; then they will have every reason to lament a measure which will give their party the most deadly blow it has ever received.

We have always contended that nothing is required to disarm and overthrow dissent beyond exposing its false pretensions, and leaving it entirely to itself; but so deeply and extensively has false liberality prevailed among churchmen, that we should have inculcated the duty of absolute separation without any other effect than that of being regarded even by our own friends as narrow-minded bigots, if dissenters themselves had not so happily enforced our arguments. Overweening confidence in their own power, and a vain belief in the weakness of the Church, have encouraged them to show themselves as they are. Their conduct has provoked disgust: it remains but to expose their weakness, to sink them to utter contempt; and nothing will more certainly promote this desirable consummation than the working of their new Marriage Bill.

Dissent will now stand in the position of a visibly distinct and hostile party; and the most lax churchman will soon find that his credit and consistency are involved in having no connexion with dissenters *as such*. We mean not that churchmen should meet none in society, and deal with none in business, but persons of their own creed. This beautiful spirit of christian charity we leave altogether to dissent, to remain, as heretofore, its own peculiar distinction. We mean, that churchmen will act upon church principles, and never compromise those principles in deference to the claims of a pretended liberality. Hitherto, dissent has been nourished and raised by a connexion with the Church. So ivy fixes upon the tree, drawing support from its strength, and vigour from its juices; so it rises and spreads over the branches, obtruding its own dull leaves for the beautiful foliage, and its own harsh berries for the wholesome fruit; so when the ungrateful parasite would strangle and destroy its benefactor, it is torn away, and left to be trodden into the mire and perish. Such has been the conduct of dissent, and such will be its fate.

A more effectual means than this Marriage Bill could not have been devised for disgusting the respectable portion of dissenting communities,

and driving them to the Church. The lady presidents, and secretaries, and committee men, and penny-a-week collectors; they who can forget what they owe to the decorum of their sex, and the duties of their home, to bustle in public as the little managers of small societies; these indeed may feel no scruple to be married in a magistrate's office; but all who retain that delicacy which is the pride of their sex, and peculiarly the glory of Englishwomen, will revolt at the desecration. The poorest girl will spurn at the idea of going before the justice with her lover, as if she were bringing to him a father to be sworn to maintain her baby. We rejoice in the conviction that England is a religious country, where it is felt that the chiefest excellence of the institutions we cherish, their beauty, strength, and dignity, is derived from the sanction of religion. Though taste, convenience, or laxity, may take many to the meeting-house, there is but a small proportion, even among dissenters, who have ceased to regard the Church with reverence, and the Clergy with respect; and all but these few will regard civil marriages as a disgusting and degrading privilege.

A certain effect of the Marriage Bill will be to aggravate internal discord among dissenters, by depriving them of their most valuable grievance. Democracy is quarrelsome in its very nature; and when denied the privilege of quarrelling with others, it is sure to quarrel with itself. Leave dissent entirely to its own bad passions, and it will need no other destroyer. Its factions will soon realize the well-known fable of the Kilkenny cats, who fought till both were devoured.

We have no doubt whatever that dissenters will object to the boon, though they have clamoured for it so loudly and so long; but we are quite indifferent to the course they take. Their motives are bad; their party is divided and weak; their character is not respectable. If they cease to attack the Church, they will be sure to bite and devour one another; if they persevere in their late conduct, they will expose themselves more and more, till all their friends become convinced, and this conviction is making rapid progress, that to be connected with them is disreputable, and to satisfy them impossible. It will soon be sufficiently evident that their claims are advanced, not because they expect or desire any advantage from them, but that they may weaken and degrade the Church: but here their friends in parliament will fail them; and they have now to deal with a Government, which, with every disposition to do them full justice, and to grant them every safe indulgence, will never allow itself to be made the dupe of their cunning, or the tool of their malice.

In strict consistency with their own character, they will be thankful, it seems, for this measure, provided only that churchmen also shall be compelled to marry by a civil contract. Truly they are modest! We are quite satisfied to remain as we are, and agree with them in thinking that the rite which involves the happiest and the most sacred of earthly duties, is far more honourable when solemnly consecrated at the altar of God, than when made a mere form of business in a magistrate's office. They may still enjoy the sanctity of our rite; why, then, would they drag us down to the degradation of theirs? But thus it has ever been. Honourable minds look up to superior excellence as to something which they admire and emulate: the base and malevolent, the

democratic, in short, as to what they desire to bring down to their own level. So the first democrats refused to be happy, even in heaven, while there was one Being in the universe above them; and having thus fallen to wickedness and misery, they strive to make the whole creation as wicked and miserable as themselves.

---

#### THE RECORD NEWSPAPER AND THE CHURCH SOCIETIES.

No reader of this publication can be unaware, that, while entertaining for ourselves the most decided opinions on the Quinquarticular controversy, we have always regarded that controversy (except remotely) unconnected with essentials. Calvinism, logically followed up, is bad enough—tantamount to Antinomianism: but educated Calvinists do not follow it up logically; they disclaim every shadow of Antinomian doctrine; and, except in speculative opinions on subjects of the most abstruse nature, do not differ from their Arminian opponents. The conversation between Wesley and the young Calvinistic minister is well known; and we perfectly agree with Mr. Simeon, “that pious men, both of the Calvinistic and Arminian persuasion, approximate very nearly *when they are upon their knees before God in prayer.*”<sup>\*</sup> They do not feel their differences to be so great as to prevent their communicating, nay, accepting the ministerial trust in the same Church; and this, surely, should be argument sufficient with both parties to keep the peace of that Church, and to strive earnestly together in her defence. The mendacious lip of schism has never dared to affirm that the Church is split into more than two parties; and we would gladly see even this pretence of disunion removed by the piety and liberality of Churchmen. We do not call upon any man to surrender his opinions on any subject, except to the force of argument; we are unprepared to resign ours on any other terms; but all that we would urge is this; that Churchmen should hold peculiar sentiments in a liberal and charitable spirit, and look rather on the essentials where they are agreed, than on the speculations in which they differ.

We have always given the great majority of our Calvinistic brethren full credit for coincidence with ourselves in the above sentiments. We never doubted the fact, and late events have abundantly proved it. The Calvinistic members of the Church have contributed their full proportion to the array of her champions in this her day of battle. The folly and danger of party spirit is indeed abundantly manifest to both sides; and sentiments more worthy of Christians and Churchmen are rapidly extinguishing the spirit of faction.

In our last paper on the subject of Mrs. Hannah More's biography, we adverted to the recent conduct of the Record, relatively to the Church Societies. In noticing it further, which we feel ourselves bound to do, our Calvinistic brethren will readily understand, from what we have already said, that we have not the smallest intention of rendering them responsible for the language of that factious and mischievous

---

<sup>\*</sup> Preface to *Horæ Homileticæ*.

journal. So far from it, it will appear in the sequel that a society supposed to be high in the confidence of the Calvinistic section, has disclaimed the advocacy of the Record with christian indignation. We are told, moreover, that Calvinistic Clergymen, patrons and advocates of that society, had determined to suspend all further communication with it until such disclaimer should appear. And we trust that, could a print coinciding with us on these minor points have been found base enough to perpetrate a similar outrage on the Church Missionary Society, we should have as readily drawn our pen against the slanderer. Every public society is, of course, open to public discussion; we have ourselves discussed the respective merits of the Church Missionaries and the Incorporated Society; and had the Record contented itself with a statement of facts, or even of temperate, though erroneous, opinions, we should not have stepped out of our way to refute a journal which is too weak to do injury by argument. But it is really too much to see the editor of a newspaper setting himself up for an arbiter of the gospel, and, while calling himself a Churchman, shamelessly charging the whole hierarchy and Clergy of England, except such as identify Calvinism with *the whole Bible*, (and we believe such are daily decreasing,) with—**IGNORANCE OF THE GOSPEL!**

Our readers are well aware that great exertions have been making to ensure to the emancipated negroes in the West Indies the fullest possible instruction and spiritual advantage in the communion of our Church. The two oldest Church Societies have stood forward most munificently; each of them having contributed £10,000 towards this object. In the case of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the sacrifice has been very great; as it amounts to considerably upwards of the sum subtracted from its annual income by Whig liberality. In the Record for December 22, 1834, we find the subject thus noticed:

“This £10,000 is to be placed at the disposal of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and it is intended to appeal to the public for additional funds. Let our readers pause before they make any response to this appeal. We intend to recur to the subject in our next number, as we consider the question involved in it to be one of no slight importance.”

This pompous alarm was accordingly followed up on the 24th December. What “the readers” of the Record might be expecting, we can scarcely conjecture. But as we know some of them who would be the last to concur in its views on this subject, we can only suppose that such, at least, expected that some very serious and awful charges would be brought against the Incorporated Society. They might also be prepared to expect that a recommendation of the superior claims of the Church Missionary Society might appear. But what must have been their astonishment at an article of nearly two closely printed columns, the whole substance of which may be comprised in this modest sentence:

“We object to christian men contributing to this fund, because, in our judgment (which has not been formed but with the greatest deliberation) *the greater part of the leading men of these societies very imperfectly, if they do at all, understand the gospel which they profess to teach.*”



So that the two noblest institutions for the dissemination of Christianity that the world ever saw are to be pronounced unworthy of public confidence on this solemn charge—that, in the deliberate judgment of that important personage and most profound theologian, **THE EDITOR OF THE RECORD**, they do not understand the gospel! Had this learned divine descended to particulars, it would have been a palpable absurdity to have defended such men as the leading members of these great societies against such an accuser. But where no accusation is made, no reply can be forthcoming. To see, however, the eminently ludicrous position which the Editor of the Record has assumed, we will only state that the president of both societies is **THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY**; that **THE BISHOPS** are the vice-presidents of the Incorporated Society; that the standing committee of the other comprises the **ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS**, together with several Archdeacons, and various distinguished Clergy and religious laymen. And the greater part of these, in the deliberate judgment of—**THE EDITOR OF THE RECORD**, (to use his own exquisite style, as peculiar, we hope, as his opinions) “very imperfectly, if they do at all, understand the gospel they profess to teach!”

As the Editor of the Record is so much better instructed in the nature of the gospel than those notorious ignoramuses the hierarchy of the English Church, it is much to be regretted, that, for the benefit of the darkling people of this country, who seem, at this rate, to be as ill-informed as the benighted negroes themselves, he has not published his own luminous views on the subject in a series of lectures. But where we cannot obtain all we want, we must be content with what we can get. Thus then, does he speak of the differences between the Evangelical and High Church bodies, as he scruples not to designate them.

“Our differences are essential and fundamental; in fact, and in practice, the answer to that all-important question, how may a man be just before God, is answered in an opposite way by the two parties; while the doctrine taught as it respects the nature and extent of that ‘holiness without which no man shall see the Lord,’ is also altogether dissimilar; so that, if the teaching of the High Church on this subject is scriptural, that of the others is fanatical; and if the instruction of the Evangelical body is correct, that of the other is deceptive, and imminently perilous.”

What say our Calvinistic friends to this? are they prepared to affirm of their brother Churchmen what Dr. Pye Smith’s “pious, and honest, and warm-hearted friend, Mr. Binney” applied both to them and to us, that we destroy more souls than we save? Do they believe that the greater part of the Clergy (Bishops included) are preaching doctrines “deceptive and imminently perilous,” (to use again the peculiar phraseology of the Record)? Would they (as we *know* a proprietor of the Record once did) tell a Clergyman, on their introduction to him at the table of a friend, that he was “a trifle in holy things, and a setter up of the dominion of Satan in the Church?” No—they would repel the very thought with honest indignation! *Individuals* may be found who would not; unworthy *individuals* both sides contain; but these would be indignantly scouted by the honest and liberal Calvinistic Clergy.



On what principle the Editor of the Record remains a Churchman it is not easy to discover. With the opinions of Mr. Binney, he wants the consistency of that eminent Christian. If the majority of the Church be what the Editor of the Record describes them, it is surely his duty to make haste out of Babylon.

When a person like the Editor of the Record sets up his opinion in opposition to that of the Bishops of the Church, his ignorance of his subject follows as a matter of course; yet, even with the presumption so strong as it is, we could scarcely have credited the intensity of this ignorance, had it not been "recorded" in his own words. Nothing can be more notorious than that, on the two points which he mentions as dividing the Church into parties as opposite as the poles (the subjects of justification and holiness)—*there is not a shadow of difference* between Calvinists and Arminians; (using those names in the popular sense.) The substantial difference between those bodies is confined to the question of predestination and the nature of baptism; for as to the degree of participation in public amusements, &c. &c. this and like matters cannot be alleged as serious differences; neither are they altogether the differences of a party, but rather of individuals.

It is curious enough to contrast the language of the Bishop of Calcutta relative to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel with that of the Editor of the Record. We know not whether the Right Reverend Prelate has now the misfortune to be considered by this eminent writer among the members ignorant of the gospel they profess to teach; but time was when we think he would have been authority to the Editor of the Record. Time was when we felt it our painful duty to censure much of his proceedings, as evincing too much of that spirit of party for which the Record is so transcendently distinguished above all aspirants. It is with the greatest pleasure that we afford this incidental testimony to the improvement evinced in all his conduct since his elevation; and we trust, that, under Providence, he may long be preserved to be a blessing to the Church in India. Thus, however, speaks the Bishop:

"At the distance of more than half the globe, my sacred functions impose on me many painful sacrifices, which nothing can so much tend to relieve as the affectionate confidence of your INCORPORATED SOCIETY, the oldest of the Protestant Mission bodies in India, and THE MOST SIGNALLY SUCCESSFUL; and well capable of taking a fresh and vigorous spring, and starting off in a new career of sacred enterprise. Amongst all the means of propagating Christianity which are entitled to my support—and none fail of some claims to it—the venerable INCORPORATED SOCIETY may rely upon my FIRST and WARMEST cooperation, to the full extent of the instruments with which she furnishes me, and the character and PIETY of the men whom she sends out."\*

Here we have the Bishop of Calcutta telling us that the Incorporated Society is the most signally successful of all the societies in propagating the gospel among the heathen. He writes from what passes beneath his own eyes. But the Editor of the Record, writing in Red Lion Court, assures us that all this is pure mistake, and the conductors of

---

\* Report of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. 1833.

the Society are so little capable of propagating the gospel, that they need to be lectured by him in what the gospel is. The Bishop of Calcutta, who knows well the Society's Missionaries, speaks of their "character and piety;" the Editor of the Record, who probably never saw one of them in his life, tells us that they are such monsters that any evangelical person would sooner die than appoint one of them to a curacy.\* "Utri creditis, Quirites?"

Not contented with abusing the two venerable Church Societies, the gifted editor proceeds to attack the Bishop of Barbados. We are not about to insult that exemplary prelate by volunteering his defence against such a writer. Could any apology for him be necessary, it has been made from a quarter whence the calumniator little expected it. The assaults on the old Societies were made, ostensibly, with a view to bring the Church Missionaries in triumph over the ruins of their predecessors' reputation. But the honourable-minded patrons of the latter Society had resolved to desert it if it should prove in any degree responsible for these calumnies; and the heads of the Society saw the necessity of openly disclaiming all connexion with the slander and the slanderer. They have done so, and done it nobly; and a more complete humiliation it is impossible to conceive than that of the unfortunate libeller, when he was obliged to insert in his newspaper of February 2d, the following advertisement:

"CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

"At a special meeting of the Committee of the Church Missionary Society, held at the Society's house on the 27th ult. the following Resolution was adopted:

"That the Committee desire to record their unfeigned sorrow at the remarks which have been recently made in the *Record* newspaper, reflecting on the conduct of the Lord Bishop of Barbados, in reference to the arrangements which have been the subject of communication between his Lordship and themselves, with a view to the extension of the Society's operations in the diocese of Barbados; and that the Committee are most anxious to convey to his Lordship the expression of their sympathy, under IMPUTATIONS SO UNWARRANTABLY MADE, and of their hope that the statement relative to the Society's proceedings in the West Indies, which was last month inserted in their official organ *The Church Missionary Record*, placing the facts of the case before the members of the Society, and which has, by an anonymous channel, been inserted in the *Record* newspaper, has shewn to the public at large the INACCURACY of the remarks in that newspaper, and so far has counteracted the MISSTATEMENTS referred to.

WILLIAM JOWETT, } Secretaries."  
DANDESON COATES,

Here we leave the Editor of the Record. Lower we cannot leave him. We are rejoiced at the opportunity his ignorance and malice have

---

\* "We are persuaded, as it respects the vast majority of them (the Record's clerical readers,) we may reply with confidence they would shudder to do so (appoint one of the Society's Missionaries to a curacy) that they durst not do it; that many of them would die first."—*Record*.

afforded of showing that there is no real disunion in the Church, whatever *individual* nominal Churchmen may do to promote dissension. To the Church Missionary Society the learned editor made his appeal—to them he looked to back his calumnies, falsehoods, and distortions—and here is their reply. Whither shall he go now to represent the Church a mass of corruption, with the exception of the enlightened few who think with him? We recommend the King's Weighhouse, where he will find a Christianity and a charity quite according to his own notions.

And now a word to Churchmen in general. Let exposures like these of enemies in the camp shew the growing necessity of unity and peace. Churchmen, like other men, will never be able to agree *in all things* as long as they "see through a glass, darkly;" but in one thing they may and must agree—the defence of their common faith; for in this they are commanded to be "all of one mind." Whoever he be who would cast firebrands among us, let him call himself High Church, or Evangelical, or what he pleases, let the indignation of all true Churchmen devote him to instant infamy. Temperate discussion, conducted in a christian spirit, is acceptable to Him who will have all men come to the knowledge of the truth; but let us learn to distinguish between the substance of Christianity, and those deeper things which are rather intimated than revealed; and, above all things, let us put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness.

---

#### TO HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

SIRE,—I TRUST there will be nothing inconsistent with that profound veneration and respect which every loyal Englishman must feel to your Majesty's crown and person, if one who trusts he cannot be surpassed in his attachment to either, should venture to address your Majesty thus publicly, through the medium of a periodical which has always been eminently distinguished for its loyalty to the throne and its devotion to the altar.

Your Majesty, Sire, has been called by Providence to your august office in a troublous time; when the enemies of Christ's holy gospel, however widely differing from each other, have banded themselves in one common cause—the destruction of that Church which your Majesty has sworn to uphold and defend. The Infidel who believes nothing, the Papist who believes every thing, and the Sectarians who believe any thing, are found beside each other in the ranks of her assailants. To your Majesty, as the head of our Church Establishment, the eyes of all her members are anxiously directed.

Your Majesty's paternal goodness, Sire, has not left us to infer your sentiments from uncertain induction. Your words and actions have been express. Your Majesty's declaration to the Bishops of our Church must ever live in grateful memory. Your Majesty, by calling to your councils men who are resolved to uphold and to purify the Church, has given a public proof of your gracious intentions. And

your loyal and religious people have received no small gratification from the following passage of your Majesty's reply to the address of your faithful Convocation: "I DERIVE GREAT SATISFACTION FROM THE ASSURANCE WHICH YOU HAVE GIVEN ME OF YOUR ZEALOUS COOPERATION IN THE MEASURES WHICH I HAVE DIRECTED WITH A VIEW TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF OUR ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEM."

On this your Majesty's gracious declaration, I most humbly solicit permission to offer to your Majesty a few remarks, which, albeit proceeding from an obscure individual, may not, on that account, be the less grounded on truth, or the less worthy the consideration even of your Majesty.

I most respectfully therefore submit to your Majesty that there is only one way in which the Convocation can cooperate with your Majesty in your gracious designs for the improvement of our ecclesiastical system: and that is, BY BEING SUMMONED FOR DISPATCH OF BUSINESS. Such an act of your Majesty's paternal care would be joyfully welcomed by great numbers of loyal Churchmen, who yet would scruple to address your Majesty in favour of an alteration (as they would conceive) in our ecclesiastical polity, too great to be hoped for at your Majesty's hands.

The measure, however, would not, in fact, be an alteration. It would be a simple return to the ancient and unabrogated rights of the Church; and, even were it otherwise, I am persuaded that your Majesty would act according to your own persuasion of what was best, uninfluenced by any consideration of inferior weight. Your Majesty has appointed a "Church Commission," to prepare materials for some important measures. In your faithful Convocation, however, your Majesty already possesses the most extensive means of attaining your object; and by nothing could the Church Commission be more effectively assisted than by the deliberations of that venerable body.

But I would further most humbly submit to your Majesty that no measures for the good of the Church can prove permanently beneficial without a Convocation to apply them as needed from time to time. No corporate body of whatever description, it is manifest from universal experience, can be conducted without a council to watch over its interests. There is not in the whole world a church, a sect, which is destitute of such a council, except the Church of England. In pleading for the revival of the functions of Convocation, I am only asking for the Church of England what every other religious society possesses. Many of the abuses which it will be the object of your Majesty's government to reform would never have had any existence, if the Convocation had been allowed its privileges; and many of those provisions which your Majesty's responsible advisers may deem it right to make for the future benefit of the Church, will fail of their intent for want of an authority to apply them, or must be applied by authority which Churchmen cannot regard without a natural and constitutional jealousy. The Houses of Parliament, Sire, have experienced great alterations in their constitution since the privileges of the Convocation were first practically suspended by your Majesty's royal predecessor, King George I. At that time they were exclusively composed of members of the Church of England: whereas now there is no *law* to

prevent them from being *exclusively composed of its enemies*. The Roman Catholic members do indeed take an oath not to use their parliamentary power to the injury of the Church; but it cannot be expected that they will use it for the *benefit* of our ecclesiastical institutions; and it is but too plain that they have interpretations of their oath widely different from the *animus imponentium*, and, indeed, from the plain grammatical construction. The Clergy of England are, besides, the only teachers of religion excluded from the House of Commons, while they are at the same time also the only teachers of religion who have not a council of their own.

These disadvantages may be redressed at once safely, quietly, beneficially, and constitutionally, by the simple revival of a right which ought never to have been suspended. When I term the functions of Convocation a *right*, I feel that I am perfectly sanctioned, even by the present practice. Your Majesty, by receiving the address of the Convocation, does, in fact, acknowledge its right to assemble, and its right to debate is only suspended by an exercise of the royal prerogative. That this prerogative should not *always* be exercised, is all that is asked. That your Majesty would take the opinion of your Convocation on matters intimately affecting the individual members and their Church and constituents, is the prayer I would venture to express.

I venture:—however humble—however unsupported. That I am humble, will not I am sure prejudice my cause in the eyes of your Majesty. As your Majesty's subject, I shall, I know, experience your kind attention and regard. If unsupported, this circumstance shall not deter me from what I cannot but consider my duty—respectfully to invite the attention of my sovereign to this important topic. But I trust I shall not be unsupported—I trust that the view I take of this question is also taken by a large portion of my fellow-subjects and fellow-churchmen; and that they will, in a voice of more influence, convey their sentiments to the throne.

That your Majesty may long preside over a grateful Church and people is the earnest prayer of your Majesty's loyal subject and faithful servant,

PRESBYTER ANGLICANUS.

---

DR. PYE SMITH A.D. 1834, *versus* DR. PYE SMITH, A.D. 1835.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

SIR,—Though I feel no inclination to engage in the kind of controversy provoked by Dr. Pye Smith, I cannot avoid noticing the inconsistency of his opinion of Churchmen, as expressed last year in his sermon "On the Necessity of Religion to the well-being of a Nation," with his strongly-expressed approbation of Binney's sweeping denunciation of the Church, as destroying more souls than it saves. "Those whom God honours, let us delight to honour. I must profess my opinion, that the increase of vital piety in the Established Church within the last thirty or forty years, has been greater than among us." Quoted from Dr. Pye Smith's Sermon, in the *London Packet*, Dec. 15, 1834.

What degree of accuracy may be imputed to the statistical view of the relative numbers of Churchmen and Dissenters in the 203 selected

places, as given in Dr. Smith's Letter, I pretend not to determine. But I am not prepared to yield an implicit assent to its alleged correctness; not only because I happen to know something of dissenting proceedings generally, but because of the facts stated by me, in April last, in a letter to a noble lord, of which letter the following is an extract:—

“From the time when the school returns were moved for, I have laboured, perhaps unjustly, under the suspicion that those returns were sought with the view of attempting to exhibit the Church and its Clergy, as more supine and inefficient in instructing the youth of the country, than their rivals are; and that such an exhibition might be construed into a reason or pretext for a legislative measure, by which the youth of the kingdom might be abstracted from the superintendence of the parochial Clergy, and transferred to the dissenters. That suspicion has been rather confirmed than weakened by subsequent opinions put forth in certain quarters.

“How far any attempts have elsewhere been made to exaggerate numbers on the side of our adversaries, I am not prepared to hazard even an opinion. That such an attempt was made in this village, the following statement, made to me by the overseer, seems to decide. He had received the school return, filled up by the dissenting minister, who keeps a day-school. (There is in the village a national school also.) The return, so filled up, not being quite intelligible to the overseer, he called upon the dissenting minister to have it explained. The number of children returned as being in the school, was forty-three; but the overseer, on calling, saw only fifteen or eighteen present; and twenty-five were made out as the entire number both present and absent! Upon the overseer's remarking on the irregularity of the return, it was replied by the dissenting minister,\* that the return might be sent as it was to London, for it would never find its way back to ——— and in London they would know nothing about it: and, I believe, that the return was so sent. Whether similar practices have in other places been resorted to, to augment the number of children instructed by dissenters, I know not.

“I may be permitted to add, that an impartial investigation of the system and effects of the Sunday School Union, or Lancasterian Schools, under the combined management of dissenters and infidels, in our densely populated districts, would demonstrate that those schools are a greater curse than a blessing to society. I could, I think, adduce something like proof of this assertion.”

In the above quotation I have omitted personal and local names, simply from feelings of delicacy to the overseer; but in my original letter, I stated names: and my object in writing to Lord ——— was to bring the subject under proper investigation. The process necessary in doing so, seemed so tedious and expensive that I abandoned it.

That Dr. Pye Smith has in his Letter to Dr. Lee, thrown off the veil of professed regard for the Church of England, I am neither surprised nor grieved: there is less danger from an open than a covert adversary. His late demonstration of hostility will probably cool the ardent

\* I should just remark that this man is incompetent to spell the English language.  
VOL. XVII. NO. IV. I I



pantings of some semi-churchmen after him, as expressed by such persons, for instance, as write in the British Critic. "Dr. J. Pye Smith . . . . . to whom we would willingly say, 'qualis cum sis, utinam noster esses.'" No. XXXIII. p. 252. Again, such dissenting phraseology as, "the various sections of the English Church," p. 229. *Various sections of the English Church!!!*

I am, Sir, Your's very truly,

E.

Mar. 11, 1835.

## MONTHLY REGISTER.

### SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

At the Sixth General Annual Meeting of the Members of the Ripon, Masham, and Aldborough Districts Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, held at the Chapter-house, Ripon Minster, on Tuesday, the 27th of January, 1835; the Rev. G. H. Webber, M.A., Prebendary of Ripon, in the Chair; the Report, from which the following is an extract, was read:—

During the past year, the Society has attained, in both these respects, to a higher degree of prosperity than it ever before reached. Its income has amounted to the sum of 74,094*l.* 16*s.* 5*d.* being an increase upon the preceding year of more than 3,000*l.* The total number of its publications circulated during the past year has amounted to 2,152,073, being an increase of 72,000 upon the preceding year. The number of Bibles distributed was 85,588; Testaments, 74,485; Prayer Books, 130,143; Psalters, 15,660; Bound Books, 126,300; Religious Tracts, 1,679,017.

These statements will be sufficient to show that there is an increasing demand for the advantages conferred by the Society, both among its own members and the public at large; and a growing disposition to give it more extensive support.

The Committee refer with pleasure to the labours of their own district, which continues to prosper and spread its benefits throughout its own limits and the neighbouring parts of the county of York. It appears, from the Treasurers' account, that the sum remitted, and now due, in 1834, to the Parent Society, amounts to 326*l.* 5*s.* 1*d.*

being 35*l.* 14*s.* in annual subscriptions, 8*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.*, the amount of the difference between the Society's *reduced price*, as charged to the Committee, and the *cost price* on books issued to non-members of the Society, according to Rule VIII.—281*l.* 17*s.* 4*d.* for books sent to the Depository. The subscriptions and donations to the District Fund amount to 58*l.* 1*s.* This statement, deducting the incidental expenses, leaves a balance of 22*l.* 4*s.* 9*d.* due to the Treasurer. The number of books issued from the Ripon Depository, in 1834, was, 312 Bibles; 339 Testaments; 781 Common Prayer Books; 1,096 Bound Books; and 7,278 Religious Tracts; making a total of NINE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND SIX, besides a considerable number of cards to National, Infant, and Sunday Schools. This large circulation of the Bible, and other Religious Books, in the district, shows the good effected by the Committee's exertions. The Bible here disseminated in our neighbourhood will "be as bread cast upon the waters, which may be found after many days;" and succeeding generations will, by the blessing of God, be made wise unto salvation, through our liberality and exertions.

Your Committee affectionately invite all who desire the kingdom of Christ to increase and prosper, to assist in this great work. The Society, which has long been employed as the great dispenser of the Word of Life at HOME, is now prepared to extend its labours to FOREIGN LANDS. The Bible and Prayer Book will now, through its agency, be circulated to the natives of



all the countries where British influence and commerce extend. The *dark places of the earth* will be enlivened by the glad tidings of salvation through the Sun of Righteousness; and every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, shall hear the name of Jesus. May all Christians assist in this labour of love

by their prayers—their money—their influence, and hasten that glorious day, when all nations shall be gathered into one fold and under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ the Righteous.

G. H. WEBBER, *Chairman*.

R. POOLE, JUN. } *Secs.*  
CHARLES TIMM, }

## POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

**DOMESTIC.**—The ministry of Sir R. Peel has made considerable progress since our last. The country already sees in excellent train, Church Reform, Law Reform, and Military Reform, and, above all, a noble and disinterested reform in the distribution of what are technically termed “the loaves and fishes.”

We cannot, however, participate in the “*Io triumph!*” which has been raised by the enemies of the agricultural interest, and the patrons of gin palaces, and ruinous monopolies, at the defeat of the Marquis of Chandos’s motion for a repeal of the malt tax, and we much question whether ministers themselves will, in the long run, have reason to rejoice. The numbers were—

For the motion . . .	192
Against . . . . .	350

Majority . . . . . 158

The abolition of imprisonment for debt, which has so long disgraced our statute book, is resolved upon.

Mr. Hume’s threat of stopping the supplies! has proved a mere *cackle of the Middlesex goose*.

The ministerial plan for the relief

of dissenters, with respect to the performance of the rite of marriage, has been received with general satisfaction, not only by the House of Commons, but by the country at large; and we are quite sure that the Clergy will be always ready to sacrifice their own private feelings, wherever christian harmony and peace may be attained, without the compromise of principle.

The anti-protestant party in the Lower House has been defeated on the Irish tithe question. The numbers being—

For ministers . . .	213
Against them . . .	198

Majority . . . . . 15

This question, however, is far from settled, for the Irish Church, and every question even remotely infringing upon it, have involved the successive administrations of the country in the most perplexing difficulties, ever since the glorious, pious, and good King William, rescued us from “*pope and popery, brass money, and wooden shoes*.”

With respect to the reformation of the Church of England, we refer our readers to the annexed:—

### FIRST REPORT FROM THE CHURCH COMMISSION,

AS FINALLY SETTLED, MARCH 17.

**TO THE KING’S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.**—We, your Majesty’s Commissioners, appointed by a Commission under the Great Seal, bearing date the 4th day of February, 1835, to consider the state of the Established Church,

with reference to ecclesiastical duties and revenues, having entered upon the inquiry committed to us, humbly offer to your Majesty this our first Report.

With the exception of a subject to which we shall advert in a subsequent

part of our Report, we have hitherto directed our attention to that branch of the inquiry which stands first in your Majesty's Commission—namely, "the state of the several dioceses in England and Wales, with reference to the amount of their revenues, and the more equal distribution of episcopal duties, and the prevention of the necessity of attaching by *commendam* to bishoprics benefices with cure of souls."

In order to present to your Majesty our suggestions upon this subject in the most convenient form, we have arranged them under the following heads—"TERRITORY," "REVENUE," and "PATRONAGE."

#### TERRITORY.

The map of England and Wales, marked according to their present ecclesiastical divisions, will exhibit the great inequality which exists between the different dioceses. This inequality, though diminished, was far from being remedied by the erection of new sees at the Reformation,\* and the inconveniences resulting from it have been greatly increased by the immense and partial growth of the population.

Although various circumstances render it impossible to establish a perfect equality of dioceses, we are of opinion that the disparity which now exists between them will admit of considerable diminution.

The extent of episcopal duties, while it increases in some degree with the population, is also materially affected by the number and distance of benefices within each diocese. It is not, therefore, to population alone that we deem it right to look on the present occasion; attention must likewise be paid to other local circumstances.

We are not prepared to recommend any increase in the total number of episcopal sees; but we are of opinion that by the union of certain existing bishoprics, of which the combined duties will not be too onerous for a single Bishop; by the erection of two new sees in the province of York; and by the transfer, in some cases, of a district from one diocese to another; an arrangement may be made for the general performance of

episcopal duties more satisfactory than that which at present subsists.

The maps and tabular statements, which accompany this report, will exhibit the actual condition of the several dioceses in England and Wales, and the alterations which we venture to suggest.

Under this head we proceed to submit to your Majesty the following propositions, subject to such modifications as, upon further inquiry, may appear to be advisable:—

1. That two new sees shall be erected in the province of York—one at Manchester, and the other at Ripon; at each of which places there is a collegiate church, well adapted for a cathedral.

2. That the diocese of Manchester shall consist of those parts of the county of Lancaster which compose the deaneries of Amounderness, Blackburn, Leyland, Manchester, and Warrington; and which now form part of the diocese of Chester.

3. That the diocese of Ripon shall consist of those parts of the county of York which compose the deaneries of Richmond, Catterick, and Boroughbridge, in the diocese of Chester; of the deanery of Craven; and of such parts of the deaneries of the Ainsty and Pontefract in the county and diocese of York, as lie to the westward of the following districts, viz. the Liberty of the Ainsty, and the Wapentakes of Barkston Ash, Osgoldcross, and Staincross.

4. That to the diocese of Carlisle shall be added those parts of Cumberland and Westmoreland, which now form part of the diocese of Chester—the deanery of Furnes and Cartmel, in the county of Lancaster, and the deanery of Kirkby Lonsdale, in the counties of Lancaster and York, also in the present diocese of Chester,—and the parish of Aldeston, in the county of Cumberland, which is now inconveniently situate in the diocese of Durham.

5. That, further, with respect to the diocese of Durham, that part of the county of Northumberland called Hexhamshire, which now belongs to the diocese of York, shall be transferred to that of Durham; and that a few insulated parishes in Yorkshire, now belonging to the diocese of Durham, shall be transferred to that of York, or Ripon, by which dioceses, under the proposed

\* The bishoprics of Chester, Peterborough, Oxford, Gloucester, and Bristol, were erected in the reign of Henry VIII.

arrangement, they will be respectively surrounded.

6. That to the diocese of Chester, reduced according to the foregoing propositions, shall be added those parts of the county of Salop which are now in the dioceses of Lichfield and Coventry, and St. Asaph; and which must then be included, with the remainder of the diocese of Chester, in the province of York.

7. That the county of Nottingham shall be transferred to the diocese of Lincoln, from that of York, which diocese will then consist of the whole county of York, except the parts which are to be included in the dioceses of Carlisle and Ripon.

8. That the diocese of Lincoln shall in future consist of the counties of Lincoln and Nottingham, which latter county will then be in the province of Canterbury.

9. That the sees of St. Asaph and Bangor shall be united; and that the diocese shall consist of the whole of the two existing dioceses (except that part which is in the county of Salop), and of all those parishes in the county of Montgomery which now belong to the dioceses of St. David's and Hereford. One advantage which will result from the union of these two sees will be the opportunity afforded of applying a part of the impropriations, which constitute nearly the whole property of the bishoprics, to the augmentation of poor and populous vicarages in the united diocese.

10. That those parishes in the county of Hereford which are now in the diocese of St. David's, and the deanery of Bridgenorth, locally situate between the dioceses of Lichfield and Hereford, shall be added to the diocese of Hereford; that those parishes which are in the county of Worcester and diocese of Hereford shall be transferred to the diocese of Worcester; and those which are in the county of Montgomery and diocese of Hereford, to the diocese of St. Asaph and Bangor.

The diocese of Bristol presents a peculiarly inconvenient arrangement. It consists of the city of Bristol, with some adjacent parishes; and of the county of Dorset, which is separated from the seat of the bishopric by the county of Somerset.

We recommend, as a more convenient arrangement, that the county of Dorset shall be transferred to the diocese of Salisbury; and that the remainder of the present diocese of Bristol, consisting of the city of Bristol and its adjacent

parishes, shall be united to some other diocese.

Two modes of effecting this object have suggested themselves to us. The first, which is that of uniting the bishoprics of Gloucester and Bristol, involves this objection, that the great and populous city of Bristol would no longer be the residence of a Bishop. The other is that of uniting the dioceses of Bristol and Llandaff, the latter having no house of residence for its Bishop. If this plan be adopted, it cannot be denied that the interposition of the Bristol Channel between the two divisions of the diocese will produce some inconvenience, and that the Bishop will be resident at a considerable distance from the greater part of his diocese; but, under all the circumstances of the case, we are prepared to recommend—

11. That the sees of Llandaff and Bristol shall be united, and that the diocese shall consist of the city of Bristol and adjacent parishes, now in the diocese of Bristol, and of the present diocese of Llandaff; with the addition of those portions of the county of Monmouth which are now in the diocese of St. David's and Hereford, and of certain parts of the deanery of Brecon now in the diocese of St. David's.

We further propose—

12. That the diocese of Gloucester shall consist of the county of Gloucester (except those parishes which are now in the diocese of Bristol, and that part of the deanery of Campden which lies to the north-east of the chapel of Snows-hill), of the deaneries of Malmesbury and Cricklade, in the county of Wilts, now in the diocese of Salisbury, and of the parishes of Red Marley, Stanton, St. James, Chaseley, Eldersfield, Bushley, Bredon, with Norton and Cutsdean, Overbury, with Washbourne, Teddington, and Alston, Sedgbarrow, and Icomb, now in the county and diocese of Worcester.

13. That the diocese of St. David's shall consist of the present diocese, except those parts which are to be transferred to the dioceses of St. Asaph and Llandaff.

14. That the diocese of Worcester shall consist of the whole county of Warwick, part of which is now in the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry, of the county of Worcester, excepting the parishes transferred to the diocese of Gloucester, and of that part of the deanery of Campden which is to be taken from the diocese of Gloucester.

15. That the diocese of Lichfield shall

consist of the counties of Stafford and Derby.

16. That the diocese of Peterborough shall consist of the counties of Northampton, Rutland, and Leicester; the last county being added to it from the present diocese of Lincoln.

17. That the diocese of Ely shall be increased by the counties of Huntingdon and Bedford, now in the diocese of Lincoln,—by the deaneries of Lynn and Fincham, in the county of Norfolk, and diocese of Norwich,—and by the archdeaconry of Sudbury, in the county of Suffolk and diocese of Norwich, with the exception of the deaneries of Sudbury, Stow, and Hartismere, which will remain in the latter diocese.

18. That the diocese of Norwich shall consist of the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, with the above-mentioned exceptions.

19. That the diocese of London shall consist of the metropolis and parts adjoining—namely, the city of London and county of Middlesex, the parishes of Barking, East Ham, West Ham, Little Ilford, Low Layton, Walthamstow, Wanstead St. Mary, Woodford, and Chingford, in the county of Essex, all in the present diocese of London; the parishes of Charlton, Lee, Lewisham, Greenwich, Woolwich, Eltham, Plumstead, and St. Nicholas Deptford, and St. Paul Deptford, all in the county of Kent, and diocese of Rochester; the borough of Southwark, and the parishes of Battersea, Bermondsey, Camberwell, Christchurch, Clapham, Lambeth, Rotherhithe, Streatham, Tooting, Graveney, Wandsworth, Merton, Kew, and Richmond, in the county of Surrey, and diocese of Winchester; and the parishes of St. Mary Newington, Barnes, Putney, Mortlake, and Wimbledon, in the county of Surrey, and in the peculiar jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury; together with all extra parochial places locally situate within the limits of the parishes above enumerated, except the district of Lambeth-palace, which shall remain in the diocese of Canterbury.

In arranging the diocese of London, our great object has been to bring under the jurisdiction of the same Bishop the metropolis and the suburban parishes; and, in assigning the boundaries of the diocese, we have adopted those fixed by an Act passed in the fourth and fifth years of your Majesty's reign, as comprising the metropolitan district.

In consideration of the great additional population which will then be

placed under the superintendence of the Bishop of London, we have thought it right to relieve that diocese from the whole county of Hertford, and from those parts of the county of Essex which are not included within the new limits.

20. That the diocese of Rochester shall consist of the city and deanery of Rochester, of the county of Essex (excepting those parishes which will remain in the diocese of London), and of the whole county of Hertford; and that an arrangement shall be effected at the earliest convenient opportunity by which a residence for the Bishop of Rochester may be provided in the county of Essex or Hertford, instead of his present house of residence at Bromley, in Kent.

21. That the diocese of Oxford shall be increased by the addition of the county of Buckingham, from the diocese of Lincoln, and of Berkshire from that of Salisbury.

22. That to the diocese of Salisbury, reduced according to the foregoing propositions, shall be added the whole county of Dorset, now part of the diocese of Bristol.

23. That the diocese of Canterbury shall consist of the county of Kent (except those parts which are to be included in the dioceses of London and Rochester), and of the district of Lambeth Palace, and the parishes of Addington and Croydon, in the county of Surrey.

24. That the diocese of Winchester shall remain unaltered, except as to those parts which are to be transferred to the dioceses of Canterbury and London.

25. Some doubts having been raised as to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Exeter over the Scilly Islands, we think that those doubts should be removed. No other suggestion is offered respecting that diocese: nor is it proposed that any alteration should be made in the diocese of Bath and Wells, or in that of Chichester.

We further propose—

26. That all parishes not specified in this report, which are locally situate in one diocese, but under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of another diocese, shall become subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the diocese within which they are locally situate.

We have used our best endeavours to learn the opinions of the several Bishops respecting these proposed arrangements, as far as they affect their respective dioceses, and have availed ourselves of many suggestions which their local knowledge enabled them to supply.

If your Majesty shall approve of the above propositions, it will be necessary that we should consider of some plan for providing a residence for each of the Bishops of Manchester and Ripon; and also for the Bishop of Lincoln, whose residence at Buckden will not then be within his diocese.

The adoption of the alterations now suggested will involve the necessity of varying the limits of some archdeaconries and rural deaneries; and we further think that it will be highly expedient to place every parish within a deanery, and every deanery within an archdeaconry; and that no archdeaconry should extend into more than one diocese.

### REVENUE.

In considering the subject of episcopal revenues, we have been materially assisted by the returns made to the Commissioners appointed under a commission issued by your Majesty in the year 1832, and extended in the years 1833 and 1834, for inquiring (amongst other things) into the "revenues and patronage belonging to the several ar-

chiepiscopal and episcopal sees in England and Wales."

These returns generally present the average of three years ending the 31st of December, 1831; but in some instances they contain corrections to a later date.

As the greater part of the episcopal revenues arises from fines on the renewal of leases, of which some are granted for three lives, renewable when a life drops, and others for 21 years, renewable every seven, and in towns for 40 years renewable every 14, it is manifest that a period of three years is too short to exhibit a correct average of the annual value of the several sees; and that an average so taken will show an excess, where large fines have recently accrued, and a deficit where no fine, or an unusually small amount of fines, has been received. But as this point has been adverted to by the Bishops in estimating the probable increase or diminution of the incomes of their respective sees, we may venture to refer your Majesty to the following table, framed from those returns, as containing information sufficiently accurate for the purposes of this report.

Net Income on 3 yrs. ave- rage, end- ing Dec. 31, 1831.	Probable Causes of Increase or Diminution.	Estimated future net Income.
--	--	------------------------------------

### DIOCESE.

#### CANTERBURY.

£		£
19,182	Expected increase of 1,544 <i>l.</i> shown by the following statement:— From fines, 1,366 <i>l.</i> , and from the diminution of the expenses of repairs of farm buildings, 400 <i>l.</i> . . . . . £1,766	17,060
	Deduct therefrom in respect of yearly allowance to be henceforth made to lessees of estates of the see, for reversionary augmentations, to the amount of 1,040 <i>l.</i> , granted by the Archbishop to poor livings in the patronage of the see . . . . . 222	gradually increasing to 20,700 <i>l.</i> in 1873.

£1,544

One-fortieth part of a sum of 60,000*l.* borrowed on mortgage under an Act of Parliament for rebuilding Lambeth Palace, and making additions to the mansion at Addington, is payable yearly, with interest on the principal remaining unpaid.

The present yearly payment amounts to 3,780*l.*, including interest, which will decrease at the rate of 60*l.* every year.

The last payment will be in 1873.

#### YORK.

12,629	The average annual amount of fines on renewals for the three years ending Dec. 31, 1831, exceeded, from particular circumstances, the usual average by at least 2,000 <i>l.</i> , and there will be a further decrease of about 20 per cent. in the amount of the proceeds of the estates generally, from the diminution of the value of agricultural produce: the income of the see will also be further reduced by augmentations of the small livings in the patronage of the Archbishop, about to be made, in addition to those already granted.	10,600
--------	---	--------

Net Income on 3 yrs. ave- rage, end- ing Dec. 31, 1831.	Probable Cause of Increase or Diminution.	Estimated future net Income.
<b>LONDON.</b>		
13,929	<p>It is expected that there will be a decrease in the future average income arising from fines upon the renewals of leases for lives, and from woods and manorial profits, to the amount together of 1,725<i>l.</i>, and a further decrease from intended augmentations of the livings in the patronage of the see, in addition to those already made.</p> <p>Besides which, 1-20th part of the sum of 10,000<i>l.</i> borrowed on mortgage for rebuilding London-house, is payable yearly, with interest on the principal remaining unpaid. The last payment will be in 1839.</p>	12,204 after 1839.
<b>DURHAM.</b>		
19,066	<p>No accurate judgment can be formed as to the future average amount of fines on the renewal of leases of mines and quarries, as the profits attending them must depend principally upon the several districts in which the collieries will be worked.</p> <p>Since the above return, the Bishop has granted permanent augmentations to small livings in his patronage to the amount of 1,170<i>l.</i> per annum out of the revenues of the see.</p> <p>No other ground for expecting increase or decrease.</p>	17,890
<b>WINCHESTER.</b>		
11,151	The augmentations already made of small livings in the patronage of the see will reduce the annual income by about 400 <i>l.</i> It is intended further to augment all the small livings in the gift of the see to 200 <i>l.</i> per annum. Except in respect of augmentations, there are no grounds for expecting that the future income will vary materially from the sum stated,	10,750
<b>ST. ASAPH.</b>		
6,301	<p>The greater part of the income of the see arises from tithes, which have gradually declined since 1827, when they amounted to 6,636<i>l.</i></p> <p>By a supplemental statement it appears that the produce of the tithes was in 1834, 5,214<i>l.</i>, which is below their average for the three years ending in 1831 by the sum of 607<i>l.</i>, and that the produce of the mines was in the same year 263<i>l.</i>, which is less than the same average by the sum of 415<i>l.</i>, showing the income of the year 1834 to be below the average stated by the sum of 1,022<i>l.</i>; and there seems to be no prospect of improvement.</p>	5,280
<b>BANGOR.</b>		
4,464	<p>By a supplemental statement it appears that the tithes in the years 1833 and 1834 have fallen below the average of the three years ending Dec. 31, 1831, by 650<i>l.</i>, or about that sum, and there is no prospect of increase.</p> <p>The average of fines is not expected to be more than 250<i>l.</i> for many years to come.</p>	3,814
<b>BATH AND WELLS.</b>		
5,946	The net income is expected to be reduced to about 5,500 <i>l.</i> per annum by the probable diminution of fines upon renewals.	5,500
<b>BRISTOL.</b>		
2,351	<p>The average upon the three years ending Dec. 31, 1831, much exceeds the usual average.</p> <p>The living of Almondsbury, permanently annexed to the see, is not expected to vary in amount.</p>	2,350
<b>CARLISLE.</b>		
2,213	From an unusual receipt of fines on renewal of leases for lives the gross annual income of the see on the last Bishop's incumbency was about 3,500 <i>l.</i> ; upon some late surveys, the estimated an-	3,000 after 1853.

Net  
Income on  
3 yrs. ave-  
rage, end-  
ing Dec. 31,  
1831.

Probable Causes of Increase or Diminution.

Estimated  
future net  
Income.

£		£
	nual value of the property has been less than on former valuations. Upon the whole, the gross yearly value of the see, which in 1832 was returned at 2,585 <i>l.</i> , may be estimated, upon an average of seven years, at 3000 <i>l.</i>	
	It should also be stated that 1-20th part of a sum of 10,000 <i>l.</i> , borrowed on mortgage for repairing and partly rebuilding Rose Castle, is payable yearly, with interest upon the remaining principal. The payments will cease in the year 1853.	
	<b>CHESTER.</b>	
3,261	Decrease expected, as the property of the see chiefly consists of tithes, which are falling in value.	3,260
	<b>CHICHESTER.</b>	
4,229	The average amount of fines on renewals for the three years ending December 31, 1831, was greater than the general average receipts under that head. It is considered that the computed average income will be reduced by 400 <i>l.</i> or 500 <i>l.</i> per annum.	3,800
	<b>ST. DAVID'S.</b>	
1,897	The average yearly receipts from fines on renewals of leases for three years, ending December 31, 1831, were 214 <i>l.</i> whereas the average of the last ten years is 1,150 <i>l.</i> per annum; but this last-mentioned average cannot be depended upon in future.	2,800
	<b>ELY.</b>	
11,105	The estimate of the last three years is rather more than the average amount of the net annual produce of the see; as the two last years, particularly 1830, afforded fines for renewals of leases which seldom occur.	11,000
	<b>EXETER.</b>	
2,713	There will in future be 21 <i>l.</i> per annum from the dividends on stock produced by the sale of houses under a local Act. In other respects no increase or decrease is anticipated.	2,734
	<b>GLOUCESTER.</b>	
2,282	A decrease in the revenues of this see will take place in consequence of the augmentation of small livings in the patronage of the see, made by the present Bishop. The amount of fines for renewals, included in this estimate, exceeds the average of the seven years preceding.	2,200
	<b>HEREFORD.</b>	
2,516	No expected increase or decrease.	2,516
	<b>LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.</b>	
3,923	If the average of fines, as far as it can be ascertained from accessible documents, were to be taken upon a period of 21 years, it would exhibit a net income considerably larger than that which has been stated, but a material reduction of the future amount of fines is to be expected from the progressive diminution of the value of land. A decrease of the profits from woods is expected. The income will also be decreased by the augmentation of poor livings in the gift of the see intended to be made. Upon the whole it is considered, that at a distant period the net income may average 4,350 <i>l.</i> per annum.	4,350
	<b>LINCOLN.</b>	
4,542	The estimate taken upon the three years ending December 31, 1831, exceeds the average of the three subsequent years by the sum of 680 <i>l.</i> The property consists almost entirely of improper rectories, with dependent vicarages, the intended augmentations of which, in virtue of the late Acts, will cause a further considerable diminution of the net annual proceeds.	4,200



Net Income on 3 yrs. ave- rage, end- ing Dec. 31, 1831.	Probable Causes of Increase or Diminution.	Estimated future net Income.
	<b>LLANDAFF.</b>	
£ 924	It is considered that upon a sufficiently extended average, the income from fines, which is stated at 73 <i>l.</i> might be taken at 400 <i>l.</i> per annum; a corresponding increase of income is therefore expected.	£ 1,250
	<b>NORWICH.</b>	
5,395	The average amount of income, taken upon the three years ending December 31, 1831, exceeds the average annual value of the revenues of the see, if computed upon the receipts for the last seven years, by the sum of 700 <i>l.</i> per annum; and there will be a reduction of income by the augmentation of small livings in the gift of the see.	4,700
	<b>OXFORD.</b>	
2,648	A decrease in the revenues of the see must be expected. The average of fines on renewal of leases for the three years ending Dec. 31, 1831, is found on calculation to exceed the average receipts from the same source which may reasonably be expected in future by about the sum of 1,060 <i>l.</i> and a deduction of 90 <i>l.</i> must be allowed for the depreciated value of tithes in hand. If the Crown shall be pleased to renew a lease granted on account of the small revenues of the see, which will expire in the year 1837, it is expected that, <i>communibus annis</i> , the net value of the see will amount to 1,658 <i>l.</i> or about that.	1,658 subject to the contin- gency stated in the pre- ceding column.
	<b>PETERBOROUGH.</b>	
3,103	The total receipts may be expected to be less in future than the average of the three years ending in 1831, as the fines upon renewals of leases, as well as the tithes of Castor, a rectory permanently annexed to the see, are continually decreasing in the amount.	3,000
	<b>ROCHESTER.</b>	
1,459	No expected increase or decrease.	1,459
	<b>SALISBURY.</b>	
3,939	If the calculation were taken upon an average embracing a period of years in which it is probable that most of the leases for lives as well as for years would be renewed, the result would exhibit a net income, <i>communibus annis</i> , of not less than 5,000 <i>l.</i> or between that sum and 6,000 <i>l.</i> per annum.	5,000
	<b>WORCESTER.</b>	
6,569	There is reason to expect a decrease of income, from the diminution of the amount of fines upon renewal of leases.	6,500

According to the foregoing table, the net income of all the bishoprics of England and Wales in the year 1831 amounted, on an average of three years, to the sum of 157,737*l.* and may now be calculated at about 148,875*l.*; but it appears that this amount is very unequally distributed, the incomes of one half of the bishoprics falling below the sum necessary to cover the expenses to which a Bishop is unavoidably subject. A different distribution of the episcopal revenues is the natural remedy of this inconvenience. Incomes must also be provided for the two new sees which are to be erected.

If the total amount of the net income of the bishoprics, as stated in the second column of the preceding table, had been liable to no further diminution, we apprehend that these objects might have been nearly accomplished by such a distribution, without any addition to these incomes by means of commendams, either with or without cure of souls; the former of which additions, we think, ought to be altogether discontinued. This might be done, by enabling the future incumbents of the richer sees, either to transfer part of the estates to the poorer bishoprics, or to pay over

annually a portion of their incomes to the Governors of Queen Anne's bounty, to be applied to the augmentation of such bishoprics; or either of these modes might be adopted, according to the particular circumstances of each case.

The total amount, as above stated, cannot be, however, considered as the future income, for the reasons alleged in the third column, which shows a diminution of nearly 9,000*l.* per annum; and a further diminution is also to be expected from the application, either in whole or in part, of impropriations, which form a considerable portion of the incomes of many bishoprics, and which in most instances they were compelled to accept, in exchange for manors and estates, for the improvement of populous and poorly endowed vicarages and curacies connected with them.

The total income of the bishoprics in England and Wales will thus no longer be sufficient to afford an adequate income to each Bishop, merely by a different arrangement; and the most obvious mode of supplying the deficiency will be permanently to annex to some of the poorer bishoprics certain Cathedral Preferment, particularly in the Chapters of St. Paul's and Westminster, on account of their position in the metropolis.

In considering the incomes of the Archbishops and Bishops, it is proper to advert not only to the expenses necessarily incurred in journeys for the purposes of confirmation, consecration, and other official duties; in maintaining ancient and extensive houses of residence; in keeping hospitality; and in contributing to all objects connected with religion and charity, in a manner suitable to their station; but to a burden which presses heavily on newly-promoted Bishops, who are seldom men of wealth. The unavoidable expenses attending their appointment are so considerable, that they may be calculated at the income of one whole year in most of the sees, and at much more than a year's income in the smaller ones.

Upon the whole, we are of opinion that where the annual income of a Bishop amounts to 4,500*l.*, it is not necessary to make any addition; nor would we recommend any diminution, unless it exceed 5,500*l.* But we think that the two Archbishops, and the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, ought to have a larger provision than the rest. These arrangements, if carried into effect, will tend to promote the desirable object of diminishing the frequency of translation.

#### PATRONAGE.

If your Majesty shall be pleased to concur in the suggestion for erecting two new sees, it will, in our opinion, be expedient for the interests of the Church that the Bishops of those sees shall possess a certain portion of patronage, in order that they may be enabled to reward deserving clergymen within their dioceses. For this purpose it will be necessary to transfer some advowsons to the Bishops of the new sees.

We do not propose that, when a district is transferred from one diocese to another, the whole of the patronage within such district should likewise pass, but in many instances partial transfer will be desirable. We, therefore, humbly submit to your Majesty the expediency of providing for all these cases, in any legislative measure which may be founded upon this report.

We respectfully beg it to be understood, that in all the proposals which we have submitted to your Majesty, we assume that regard will be had to vested interests; and that none of the proposed changes shall take place with respect to Bishops, or Incumbents, now in possession, without their consent.

The subject alluded to at the commencement of our report, as one to which we had given our attention out of its regular course, is that of a vacancy in one of the prebendal stalls in the collegiate church of Westminster; respecting which we, at our first meeting, received the following letter from the Chancellor of your Majesty's Exchequer:—

“Whitehall, Feb. 4.

“My Lords and Gentlemen,—I feel it to be my duty to inform you, that a vacancy having taken place in a prebendal stall at Westminster, I have advised his Majesty to suspend any appointment to that stall until the circumstances connected with it can undergo the inquiry and consideration of the Commission of which you are members; and I have it in command from his Majesty to inform you, that he shall be prepared, so far as the Royal prerogative is concerned, to make any arrangement with respect to this preferment which shall appear to the Commission best calculated to effect the important object for which the Commission was appointed, and in the successful prosecution of which his Majesty takes the deepest interest.—I have the honour, &c.

“ROBERT PEEL.”

Impressed with this strong mark of the desire which your Majesty entertains to

forward the objects of this Commission, we proceeded without delay to consider of the best method of giving effect to your Majesty's gracious intentions.

We ascertained upon inquiry, that the parish of St. Margaret, Westminster, which adjoins the collegiate church, has no individual Rector or Vicar, but that the Dean and Chapter, who are the Rectors, are bound to provide for the cure of souls, which they generally do by committing it to one of their own body. We further found that the parish contained, according to the last census, a population of 25,334; and that, besides the parochial church (of which a portion is devoted to the use of the House of Commons), it has no regular place of worship according to the rites of the Church of England. But there is a chapel, called Broadway Chapel, capable of accommodating about 1000 persons, which belongs to the Dean and Chapter, and is by them leased, at a nominal rent, to a Clergyman, who performs the duty and receives the pew rents, but has no parochial charge. It appeared to us, therefore, that the vacant stall could not be better applied than by making it subservient to the spiritual wants of this very populous and increasing parish.

With this view we propose that the church of St. Margaret shall be permanently annexed to the vacant stall in the collegiate church: and that a portion of the annual profits of the stall shall be suffered to accumulate, until a new church shall be built; when the parish shall be divided, and the incumbent of the new parish shall receive that annual portion; the accumulation being applied towards providing a parsonage-house for such incumbent.

We deemed it right to communicate to the Dean and Chapter our proposals on this head; and we have great satisfaction in stating to your Majesty their prompt acquiescence, and their readiness to give up to your Majesty the patronage of St. Margaret's Church. They at the same time voluntarily offered to surrender, as far as the law would allow them, their property in Broadway Chapel, with the view of its becoming a chapel of ease to the rectory of St. Margaret, with a certain district assigned to it. Should this arrangement take effect, it may be considered proper that a small portion of the income of the stall should be appropriated to the Minister of Broadway Chapel.

We are proceeding with all diligence in our inquiry respecting the other im-

portant subjects to which your Majesty has been pleased to direct our attention; and shall forthwith take into our consideration the present state of the cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with the view of submitting to your Majesty some measures by which those foundations may be made more conducive than they now are to the efficiency of the Established Church.

We cannot conclude this report without gratefully acknowledging the additional proof of your Majesty's anxiety to promote the important objects of this Commission, which has been afforded in the communication of your Majesty's intention to defer any nomination to the prebendal stall in the cathedral of Canterbury, which has recently become vacant, until the circumstances connected with it shall have undergone our consideration.

We have the satisfaction of informing your Majesty, that the Lord Chancellor and the Archbishops and Bishops, who are members of this Commission, have signified to us their intention of pursuing, with regard to ecclesiastical preferments in their respective patronage not connected with the cure of souls, the same course which your Majesty has been graciously pleased to adopt with regard to the patronage of the Crown.

The appointment to a prebendal stall which has recently become vacant at York, has accordingly been reserved by the Archbishop of York until the Commissioners shall have had an opportunity of reporting their opinion as to the best arrangement that can be made with respect to it.

Your Majesty's gracious communication, acquainting us that, in the event of the avoidance of bishoprics or other preferments in the gift of the Crown, the holders of which may have in their patronage dignities or offices not connected with the cure of souls, your Majesty will make such conditional appointments as shall reserve all such dignities or offices for the consideration of the Commissioners, will enable us to proceed in our inquiries with that caution and circumspection which it is so desirable to observe; and will, at the same time, preclude the possibility of any inconvenience from the delay, which is inseparable from full and minute inquiry into matters so important and so various in respect to their local peculiarities.

Note.—The tables in the Appendix have been framed from the returns made

to the Ecclesiastical Revenues Commission, which are now in course of printing. These and other returns vary as to the precise number of benefices in each diocese; but as the main object at present is to show a comparison between the existing and the proposed condition of the several dioceses, the most important point is to have one uniform source of information; and minute accuracy, either as to the number of benefices or the amount of population in each case, is not considered essential. Such accu-

racy would, indeed, be rendered extremely difficult by the necessary interchanges which are proposed, of parts of counties, and of districts and parts of districts, in some cases according to the ecclesiastical, and in others according to the civil divisions of the country. It is hoped that the nearest possible approximation has been arrived at which is consistent with these circumstances, and with the present state of the returns; and the tables will be found to agree in their general results.

## APPENDIX, No. 1.

Present Condition of the several Dioceses in England and Wales, with Reference to the Number of Benefices and to Population.

PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.		
DIOCESE.	No. of Benefices.	Population.
Canterbury .....	343	402,885
St. Asaph .....	131	197,392
Bangor .....	124	153,344
Bath and Wells .....	441	403,908
Bristol .....	254	263,328
Chichester .....	267	236,950
St. David's .....	407	372,685
Ely .....	149	126,316
Exeter .....	611	773,251
Gloucester .....	281	275,806
Hereford .....	256	207,541
Lichfield & Coventry .....	606	983,783
Lincoln .....	1,234	855,039
Llandaff .....	192	183,990
London .....	635	1,688,899
Norwich .....	1,021	692,163
Oxford .....	209	139,581
Peterborough .....	290	186,193
Rochester .....	94	196,716
Salisbury .....	386	320,547
Winchester .....	416	780,214
Worcester .....	212	357,548
PROVINCE OF YORK.		
York .....	891	1,463,503
Carlisle .....	127	127,701
Chester .....	554	1,902,354
Durham .....	146	452,637

## APPENDIX, No. 2.

Condition of the several Dioceses in England and Wales, with Reference to the Number of Benefices and to Population, according to the Proposed Alterations.

PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.		
DIOCESE.	No. of Benefices.	Population.
Canterbury .....	381	423,069
St. Asaph & Bangor .....	253	339,450
Bath and Wells .....	441	403,908 unalt <sup>d</sup>
Chichester .....	267	236,950 unalt <sup>d</sup>
St. David's .....	391	365,646
Ely .....	554	395,547
Exeter .....	611	773,251 unalt <sup>d</sup>
Gloucester .....	363	324,198
Hereford .....	264	218,392
Lichfield .....	459	612,535
Lincoln .....	780	506,745
Llandaff and Bristol .....	233	303,875
London .....	244	1,746,504
Norwich .....	809	568,285
Oxford .....	523	388,043
Peterborough .....	498	394,567
Rochester .....	536	471,813
Salisbury .....	398	315,405
Winchester .....	391	495,846
Worcester .....	355	573,120
PROVINCE OF YORK.		
York .....	595	583,132
Carlisle .....	285	435,432
Chester .....	246	462,506
Durham .....	152	459,964
Manchester .....	205	208,533
Ripon .....	153	739,748

Nos. 3 and 4 are Maps of England and Wales, showing the respective Boundaries of the Present and of the Proposed Dioceses.

Another most important and interesting measure has been introduced by Sir Robert Peel, for the Commutation of Tithes in England and Wales. The Right Honourable Baronet declared that "the first principle of the plan he should propose was, that great

encouragement should be held out to parishes to make *voluntary* composition with the proprietors of tithes, introducing a new principle of commutation." We sincerely congratulate the friends of the Church upon this circumstance, convinced, as we are,

that the adoption of this plan will place the Clergy of the Establishment in a most favourable point of view, and convict the foul-mouthed slanderers, who talk of Clerical oppression and avarice, of base and deliberate falsehood.

We should be doing injustice to a nobleman of the most distinguished and honourable character, were we not to record in our pages the high-spirited and most noble conduct of the Marquis Londonderry. This eminent diplomatist and gallant officer, was selected by his Majesty for the honourable and important post of Ambassador to the Court of Russia, which gave great umbrage to Colonel Evans, and the officers of the Lumber Troop, who thought themselves invidiously overlooked. Mr. Hume, the *capital goose*, as he facetiously (funny fellow!) designated himself, immediately *cackled* to arms, and the *Greek* troops, and *light (fingered)* infantry, obeyed the summons. The result was a most disgusting outpouring of verbal filth, which brother Jonathan calls *slang-zhanging*, from the representatives of Cow-cross and Petticoat-lane; who advocate the cause of rebellion and anarchy in Poland and elsewhere. The high-minded Marquis, thinking that the Government might be embarrassed by this combination, and feeling that his exertions would be cramped by the prejudices thus unwarrantably excited against him, at once tendered his resignation, and by this act has entailed another debt of gratitude upon his country, which the page of history will record, and which we hope to see promptly rewarded by a ducal coronet.

FRANCE.—Ministerial changes continue; in fact, it would appear impossible to constitute a ministry capable of maintaining their places for a month.

AUSTRIA.—The Emperor of Austria is dead; but we are happy to say that the prophets of evil, who have been foretelling so much mischief from their *fictitious* character of his successor, are all dumbfounded. The new emperor continues Prince Metternich as his chief counsellor, and the Conservative cause in Germany is looking up.

SPAIN.—The King's forces under Zumalacarguy and Ituralde are said to amount to 40,000 men; half this number, however, would be sufficient to annihilate the rebels under Mina, and we confidently anticipate that by Midsummer-day, Don Carlos will have been proclaimed in the Prado at Madrid, and the two queens be *en route* for—wherever they please.

RUSSIA.—Considerable excitement has been felt as to the amicable relations between this mighty empire and Great Britain, and the City *quidnuncs* construed the change of station of a part of our fleet in the Mediterranean into a hostile demonstration; and some sump put a foolish question, in the House of Commons, on this head, but he received what the Backwoodsmen term a settler, from the War Secretary, who informed the note of interrogation (the little crooked thing that asks questions,) that the only war he anticipated, was a war of words in that house, and from that party of which the little man was the mouth-piece. The truth is, the prosperity of the monarchical governments naturally distresses the Radicals; and Russia is too much respected abroad, and too contented at home, to please the Destructive faction.

AMERICA.—The *Yankees* threaten *Johnny Crupeau*, and we hear of privateers, and a fleet. We have not yet seen them.

## UNIVERSITY, ECCLESIASTICAL, AND PAROCHIAL INTELLIGENCE.

### TRIBUTES OF RESPECT.

REV. MR. WILLIAMS.—A handsome silk gown and cassock, a silver pocket service for administering the sacrament to the sick, and a 4to edition of Bishop Mant's Bible and Prayer Book, were lately presented by the parishioners of St. Lawrence, Reading, to the Rev. Mr. Williams, "on retiring from the curacy of that parish, January 11, 1835, as a testimonial of their esteem, and in remembrance of his truly christian discharge of the various duties of his important office."

**REV. JUST HENRY ALT.**—Two rich and massive silver salvers were presented, in January last, to the Rev. Just Henry Alt, on his retirement from the Curacy of St. Giles', Cripplegate, London, to his promotion to the Vicarage of Enford, Wilts, as a token of grateful and affectionate remembrance of his late parishioners, for his uniformly zealous and efficient discharge of his sacred duties.

**BRIDGNORTH.**—The Rev. H. Dalton has resigned his living at Bridgnorth, that he may be at liberty to promulgate the doctrines of the late Rev. E. Irving!

**CLERICAL LORDS.**—In addition to the late Earl of Scarborough, and the late Earl Nelson, there are the Rev. Andrew Windsor, Earl of Plymouth; the Rev. Francis North, Earl of Guildford; the Rev. W. H. Ward, Baron Ward; the Rev. Thomas de Grey, Baron Walsingham; and, the Rev. H. W. Powlett, Baron Bayning.

**ORDINATION.**—The Bishop of Lincoln's next ordination will be held at Buckden, on Trinity Sunday, the 14th of June. Candidates are requested to send their papers to his Lordship before the 3d of May.

**ORDINATIONS.—1835.**

*By the Bishops of Exeter, Lincoln, and Sodor & Man.*

DEACONS.					
Name.	Degree.	College.	University.	By Bishop of	
Barber, William . . . . .	B.A.	Corpus Christi	Camb.	Lincoln	
Barnes, Henry M. B. . . . .	B.A.	Oriel	Oxf.	Exeter	
Barnes, Richard Nelson . . . . .	B.A.	Pembroke	Camb.	Exeter	
Bleamish, — . . . . .	Lit.			Sodor & Man	
Burrough, James W. . . . .	B.A.	Queen's	Oxf.	Exeter	
Cain, — . . . . .	Lit.			Sodor & Man	
Clarke, Theophilus ( <i>let. dim.</i> ) . . . . .	B.A.	Corpus Christi	Camb.	Lincoln	
Clarke, Thomas . . . . .		Queen's	Oxf.	Exeter	
Eales, W. T. H. . . . .	B.A.	Trinity	Camb.	Exeter	
Green, Henry . . . . .	B.A.	Magdalen	Camb.	Lincoln	
Hamilton, Joseph . . . . .	B.A.	Pembroke	Oxf.	Lincoln	
Hammond, James . . . . .	B.A.	Queen's	Camb.	Lincoln	
Hugall, William Henry ( <i>let. dim.</i> ) . . . . .	S.C.L.	St. Mary's Hall	Oxf.	Lincoln	
Hurst, William . . . . .	B.A.	Clare	Camb.	Lincoln	
Hyndman, — . . . . .	Lit.			Sodor & Man	
Jollands, John . . . . .		Emmanuel	Camb.	Lincoln	
Jowett, Edward ( <i>let. dim.</i> ) . . . . .	B.A.	Caius	Camb.	Lincoln	
Marsden, William D. . . . .	B.A.	Catharine	Camb.	Lincoln	
Marsland, George . . . . .	B.A.	Brasenose	Oxf.	Lincoln	
Melhuish, Thomas William . . . . .	S.C.L.	St. Peter's	Camb.	Exeter	
Moore, Edward . . . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Lincoln	
Morshead, John P. A. . . . .	B.A.	Exeter	Oxf.	Exeter	
Parkinson, Arthur M. ( <i>let. dim.</i> ) . . . . .	B.A.	Jesus	Camb.	Lincoln	
Rendall, Edward . . . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Exeter	
Riley, Richard W. . . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Exeter	
Scott, John James . . . . .	M.A.	Exeter	Oxf.	Exeter	
Scott, Thomas Arthur ( <i>let. dim.</i> ) . . . . .	B.A.	Clare	Camb.	Lincoln	
Spencer, John ( <i>let. dim.</i> ) . . . . .	B.A.	Jesus	Camb.	Lincoln	
Strickland, N. C. ( <i>let. dim.</i> ) . . . . .	M.A.	Lincoln	Oxf.	Lincoln	
Vachel, — . . . . .	Lit.			Sodor & Man	
Ward, William S. . . . .	B.A.	Corpus Christi	Camb.	Lincoln	
PRIESTS.					
Affleck, J. D. ( <i>let. dim.</i> ) . . . . .	B.A.	Christ Church	Oxf.	Lincoln	
Brooke, — . . . . .	Lit.			Sodor & Man	
Browne, Wilse . . . . .	B.A.	Emmanuel	Camb.	Exeter	
Chudleigh, Nicholas Ford . . . . .	B.A.	Magdalen	Oxf.	Exeter	
Dupré, Michael Thomas . . . . .	B.A.	Lincoln	Oxf.	Lincoln	
Gregory, Lewis . . . . .	B.A.	Trinity	Camb.	Exeter	
Heathcote, George . . . . .	B.A.	St. John's	Camb.	Lincoln	
Hodgson, Belby Porteus . . . . .	B.A.	Trinity	Camb.	Lincoln	
Kempe, John Edward . . . . .	B.A.	Clare Hall	Camb.	Exeter	

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Degree.</i>	<i>College.</i>	<i>University.</i>	<i>By Bishop of</i>
Kent, John . . . . .	B.A.	Wadham	Oxf.	Lincoln
Lawford, John Grant . . . . .	M.A.	Wadham	Oxf.	Lincoln
Mallock, William . . . . .	M.A.	Balliol	Oxf.	Exeter
Popham, J. L. ( <i>let. dim.</i> ) . . . . .	B.A.	Wadham	Oxf.	Lincoln
Powell, Edward A. . . . .	M.A.	Christ's	Camb.	Lincoln
Rowlandson, John . . . . .	B.A.	Queen's	Camb.	Exeter
Smith, Thomas T. . . . .	B.A.	St. Peter's	Camb.	Exeter
Winslow, — . . . . .	Lit.			Sodor & Man

Deacons, 31.—Priests, 17.—Total, 48.

## CLERICAL APPOINTMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment.</i>
Gedge, Sydney . . . . .	Mast. of King Edw. the Sixth's Gram. School, Birmingham.
Hewson, Frank . . . . .	Curacy of Dean, Ireland.
Holden, William Rose . . . . .	Chaplain. of St. Oswald's Hospital, Worcester.
King, Charles . . . . .	Vicarship in Cathedral Church of Sarum.
Roberts, F. J. F. . . . .	Chaplain. to London Society of Ancient Britons.
Seymour, M. H. . . . .	Rectorship of Crosmolina, Ireland.
Vane, John . . . . .	Chaplaincy to the House of Commons.
Whitcombe, C. . . . .	Domestic Chaplain to Earl of Tankerville.
Wilson, Edward . . . . .	Curacy of Leeds, Yorkshire.
Wood, Samuel R. . . . .	Chaplain to Christ Church, Oxford.

## PREFERMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Allen, J. B. . . . .	Marypowder, R.	Dorset	Bristol	Earl Beauchamp
Bennet, C. H. . . . .	Ousden, R.	Suffolk	Norwich	Rev. C. H. Bennet
Bradley, R. B. . . . .	Cotthelstone, P.C.	Somerset	B. & W.	Vicar of Kingstone
Burnaby, G. . . . .	St. Peter's, Thanet, V.	Kent	Cant.	Lord Chancellor
Clarkson, C. . . . .	Elworthy, R.	Devon	Exeter	Rev. T. Roe
Coney, T. Boucher.	Chedzay, R.	Somerset	B. & W.	Rev. T. Coney
Cooper, Henry . . . . .	Rye, V.	Sussex	Chichester.	Lord G. Cavendish
Croly, George . . . . .	St. Stephen, Walbrook, R.	London	London	Lord Chancellor
Duthie, A. H. . . . .	Sittingbourne, V.	Kent	Cant.	Abp. of Canterbury
Dymock, E. H. . . . .	Hadnel, P.C.	Salop	Lichfield	Rector of Grinshill
Edgell, E. . . . .	Rodden, P.C.			
Eveleigh, James' . . . . .	{ Alkham cum Cassel Le Fer, V. }	{ Kent	{ Cant.	{ Abp. of Canterbury
Frye, P. . . . .	{ St. Winnowe, V. }	{ Cornw.	{ Exeter	{ D. & C. of Exeter
Goode, Wm. . . . .	{ St. Antholin and St. John Baptist, R. }	{ London	{ London	{ The King
Guthrie, John . . . . .	{ Calne, V. Cherhill, P.C. Berwick Bassett, C. }	{ Wilts	{ Sarum	{ Treas. of Sarum
Hayne, Rd. . . . .	St. Olave, Exeter, R.	Devon	Exeter	The King
Jennings, T. F. . . . .	St. Philip's, N. Ch.	Bristol	Bristol	Corporation
Lane, T. L. . . . .	Wasperton, V.	Warwick	Worcester	Rev. John Lucy
Law, R. V. . . . .	Yeovilton, R.	Somerset	B. & W.	Bishop of B. & W.
Leighton, F. K. . . . .	St. Chadd, P.C.	Cheshire	Chester	Rector of Malpas
Luscombe, J. . . . .	{ Chilton and Edington, P.C. }	{ Somerset	{ B. & W.	{ Rev. R. J. Luscombe
Marsh, Wm. . . . .	{ Ashburton, V. Bickington, C. Buckland, C. }	{ Devon	{ Exeter	{ D. & C. of Exeter
Monkhouse, W. . . . .	Goldington, V.	Beds	Lincoln	Duke of Bedford
Musgrave, T. . . . .	Orwell, V.	Camb.	Ely	Lord Chancellor
Pearce, Roger . . . . .	Llanmaddock, R.	Glamorg.	St. David's	Rev. Dr. Hewson
Phipps, Hon. A. F. . . . .	{ Halesworth, R. Chediston, R. }	{ Suffolk	{ Norwich	{ R. P. Ward, Esq.
Rawlings, E. . . . .	Hatford, R.	Berks	Sarum	J. Paynter, Esq.
Rose, Charles . . . . .	Cublington, R.	Bucks	Lincoln	Lincoln Coll. Oxford
Swainson, C. L. . . . .	St. Giles, Oxford, V.	Oxford	Oxford	St. John's College



<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Tanner, T. . . . .	Nynehead, V.	Somerset	B. & W.	The King
Teale, Wm. H. J. . .	Batley, V.	York	York	Earl of Cardigan
Thorne, Joseph . . .	Bishopscynmpton, V.	Devon	Exeter	Bishop of Exeter
Wells, Archd. of . .	Weston-super-Mare,	Somerset	B. & W.	Bishop of B. & Wells

#### CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Capper, James . . .	Wilmington, V.	Sussex	Chich.	Lord G. Cavendish
Denison, Wm. . . .	Cublington, R.	Bucks	Lincoln	Lincoln Coll. Oxford
Drury, B. H. . . .	Tugley, V.	Leicester	Lincoln	Lord Chancellor
Evans, S. . . . .	Llandewy with Garthbrenegy, P.C.	Brecon	St. David's	Bp. of St. David's
Frank, Edward . . .	Shetton with Hardwicke, R.	Norfolk	Norwich	The King
Hand, J. T. . . . .	Ousdon, R.	Suffolk	Norwich	Rev. C. H. Bennet
Hawkins, C. B. . .	Lewknor, V.	Oxford	Oxford	All Souls' College
Mansel, H. L. . . .	Cosgrave, R.	Northam.	Peterbro'	J. C. Mansel, Esq.
Scott, Thomas . . .	Wappenham, R.	Northam.	Peterbro'	Bishop of Lincoln
Shipley, C. . . . .	Marypowder, R.	Somerset	B. & W.	Earl of Beauchamp
Short, Laurence . .	Ashover, R.	Derbysh.	Lichfield	A. L. Maynard, Esq.
Smith, A. J. . . . .	Carlton, P.C. Alkham and Capel de Fer, V.	Lincoln	Lincoln	J. Forster, Esq.
Stordy Joseph . . .	Kirkhampton, R.	Kent	Cant.	Abp. of Canterbury
Turner, Samuel . .	Altenborough with Bramcote, V.	Cumb.	Carlisle	Earl of Lonsdale
Walker, Robert . .	Rothwell, R.	Notts	York	F. Fojambe, Esq.
Williams, Robert . .	St. Winnow, V.	Lincoln	Lincoln	Lord Middleton
Wilmott, William .	Cowbridge and Llanbethiam, P.C.	Cornw.	Exeter	Bishop of Exeter
	Trinity Ch., Halifax, P.C.	Glamorg.	Llandaff	D. & C. of Gloucester
		York	York	Vicar of Halifax

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment.</i>
Albany, T. . . . .	Chaplain to London Society of Ancient Britons.
Armstrong, Henry . .	Curate of Thurles.
Barrick, Robert . . .	Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge.
Clapham, John Henry .	Rector of Port of Spain, Trinidad.
Hutchins, Thomas . .	Chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford.
Marshall, John . . .	Curate of Oldbury, Worcester.

#### OXFORD.

##### ELECTIONS.

The Proctors for the ensuing year have been elected by the two Colleges named in the Procuratorial Cycle, Jesus and Pembroke; and the election, signified according to the statute, to the Vice-Chancellor. The Proctors elect are—the Rev. Edmund Goodenough Bayly, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College; and Robert Evans, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, and one of the Vinerian Scholars of the University.

In Convocation, the following gentlemen having been nominated by the Vice-Chancellor as Examiners for the Hertford University Scholarship, were approved by the House.—The Rev. the Principal of St.

Alban Hall; the Rev. the Principal of New Inn Hall; and the Rev. Thomas Short, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College.

Mr. Francis Dyson has been elected to the Frost Scholarship, and Mr. Thomas Meyrick to the Wiltshire Scholarship, of Corpus Christi College.

Edward Lowry Barawell, B.A., of Balliol College, William Dyke, Commoner of Exeter College, and Richard Williams Mason, Commoner of Jesus College, have been elected Scholars of Jesus College, in this University.

In a Convocation, holden March 16, the revised Body of Aularian Statutes, having

been previously promulgated in Convocation of the 12th instant, passed the House.

At the same time, the nomination of the following gentlemen, to be public Examiners, was unanimously approved:—

*In Literis Humanioribus.*—Mr. Claughton, of Trinity; Mr. Michell, of Lincoln.

*In Disciplinis Mathematicis et Physicis.*—Mr. Walker, of Wadham.

The Examiners appointed to adjudge the annual prize for the more diligent cultivation of Latin literature, Dr. Cramer, Dr. Cardwell, and Mr. Short, of Trinity, have given notice that the Examination will be holden in the Schools, on Monday, the 6th of April, and the following days.—Gentlemen who desire to offer themselves as Candidates, are to leave their names with the Principal of New Inn Hall, together with certificates of their standing, and of the consent of the Head or Vicegerent of their College or Hall, three days, at least, before the commencement of the Examination. All Undergraduate Members of the University, who have not exceeded two years from their matriculation, may become Candidates.

#### DEGREES CONFERRED.

##### DOCTORS IN CIVIL LAW.

Edwin Maddy, Esq., Brasenose College, Judge of the Consistory Court in the Diocese of Gloucester, Grand Compounder.  
Rev. James Duke Coleridge, Balliol College, Prebendary of Exeter.

##### BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

Rev. Geo. Davies Kent, Fellow of Corpus.

##### MASTERS OF ARTS.

Rev. Edw. H. Dymock, Brasenose Coll.  
Charles Lewis Parker, Wadham Coll.  
Rev. Tho. Lingen Allen, Worcester Coll.  
Rev. Arthur Richard Stert, Exeter Coll.  
Rev. Edw. Bigge, Fell. of Merton Coll.  
J. Cunningham Robertson, University Coll.  
Rev. Essex Holcombe, Jesus Coll.  
Rev. P. A. Cooper, Oriel Coll.  
Rev. W. M. Leir, Wadham Coll.

##### BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW, BY COMMUTATION.

Travers Twiss, M.A., Fell. of Univer. Coll.

##### BACHELORS OF ARTS.

Forrester Wilson, New Inn Hall, Gr. Comp.  
Samuel Pidwell, Worcester Coll.  
Henry James Cotton, Worcester Coll.  
Rev. A. N. Buckeridge, St. John's Coll.  
Hon. Fran. Nath. Clements, Oriel Coll.  
Henry Kingsmill, Trinity Coll.  
W. Day, Postmaster of Merton Coll.

#### ASHMOLEAN SOCIETY.

The President in the Chair.

The following gentlemen were elected Members:—

The Rev. C. P. Eden, M.A., Oriel Coll.; T. Branker, B.A., Wadham Coll.; W. C. Rickman, B.A., Christ Church.

A paper was read by Mr. Bigge, on the Natural History of the Wasp, which gave rise to a discussion, in which Mr. Twiss, Dr. Kidd, Dr. Burton, Mr. Bullock, Mr. Marriott, Dr. Buckland, and Mr. Denison, took part.

A paper was then read by Dr. Kidd, on the Production of Manna in Arabia. It was illustrated by a drawing. Some observations were made on the subject by Mr. Plumtre.

A Summary of the Members of the University, January, 1835.

	Members of Convocation.	Members on the Books.
University Coll.	109	218
Balliol Coll. . . .	169	279
Merton Coll. . . .	64	129
Exeter Coll. . . .	125	307
Oriel Coll. . . .	154	302
Queen's Coll. . . .	172	343
New Coll. . . .	64	147
Lincoln Coll. . . .	72	131
All Souls' Coll. . .	67	97
Magdalen Coll. . .	113	159
Brasenose Coll. . .	233	396
Corpus Coll. . . .	86	129
Christ Ch. Coll. . .	479	986
Trinity Coll. . . .	112	264
St. John's Coll. . .	119	220
Jesus Coll. . . .	59	153
Wadham Coll. . . .	84	228
Pembroke Coll. . .	101	192
Worcester Coll. . .	94	211
St. Mary Hall . . .	24	43
Magdalen Hall . . .	54	167
New Inn Hall . . .	1	32
St. Alban Hall . . .	10	35
St. Edmund Hall . .	46	83

	2551	5251
Matriculations . .	369	
Regents . . . .	220	
Determining Bachelors in Lent	238	

In January, 1834, there were 2519 Members of Convocation, and 5290 Members on the Books.

#### MARRIED.

The Rev. William Reece Davies, M.A., Fellow of Worcester College, on the foundation of Sir T. Cookes, to Mrs. Pitt, of Nash Court.

## CAMBRIDGE.

## ELECTIONS.

*Craven Scholarship.*—William A. Osborne, Scholar of Trinity College, has been elected a Craven Scholar.

*Pitt Scholar.*—William G. Humphrey, of Trinity College, has been elected University Scholar on the Pitt Foundation.

## GRACES.

The following have passed the Senate:—

To authorize the Vice-Chancellor to contribute, on the part of the University, the sum of 100*l.* towards the completion of a new drain, proposed to be made in New Town—provided all parties interested consent to forego their right to use the present sewer, which passes through the land purchased of the Master and Fellows of Trinity Hall, for a New Botanic Garden.

To confirm the appointment of J. L. Hubbersty, Esq., M.D., of Queen's College, to the office of Deputy High Steward.

To appoint the Vice-Chancellor, the Heads, Bursars, and Tutors, of the several Colleges, the Professors of the University, the Deputy High Steward, the Public Orator, the Librarian, the Registrar, the Vice-Provost of King's College, the Vice-Master of Trinity College, and the President of St. John's College (or such of them as may be willing to act), and also Mr. Simeon and Mr. Craufurd, of King's College; Mr. Martin, Mr. Perry, and Mr. C. Wordsworth, of Trinity College; Mr. W. Selwyn, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Merivale, of St. John's College; Mr. Phillips, of Queen's College, and Mr. Smith, of Caius College, a Syndicate to collect subscriptions for the purpose of building a New Library, and of carrying into effect the other important objects contemplated in the purchase of the "Old Court" of King's College, it being understood that the present Library shall not be pulled down nor disturbed until the buildings intended to be erected upon the site of the "Old Court" shall be fit for the reception of books; and also, that the powers of the Syndicate shall expire on the last day of May next.

N.B. The Subscription has been opened, and liberally supported.

A Grace has also passed the Senate, to confer the degree of D.D. upon Mr. Williamson, of Trinity College, by Royal Mandate.

## DEGREES CONFERRED.

## HONORARY MASTERS OF ARTS.

Lord J. de la Poer Beresford, Trin. Coll.  
The Hon. John Sandilands, Trinity Coll.

## MASTERS OF ARTS.

Thos. Oswald Cockayne, St. John's Coll.  
George Maynard, Caius Coll.

## BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW.

Rev. C. Walter Hudson, Catharine Hall.

## BACHELORS OF ARTS.

William Henry Leathley, Trinity Coll.  
Sutton Ray, Trinity Coll.  
William P. Jesson, Trinity Coll.  
John B. Hyndman, Trinity Coll.  
Nathaniel R. Herring, Trinity Coll.  
Edward Gurdon, Trinity Coll.  
Robert James Atty, St. John's Coll.  
Edward Owen Hornby, St. John's Coll.  
Benjamin A. Marshall, St. Peter's Coll.  
John Fellowes, Clare Hall.  
William D. Bates Bertles, Pembroke Coll.  
Edw. Hen. Houghton, Corpus Christi Coll.  
John B. Meadows, Corpus Christi Coll.  
Richard Laurie, Queen's Coll.  
Henry Holmes, Queen's Coll.  
John D. Prior, Queen's Coll.  
Christopher Bush, Catharine Hall.  
Thomas Walker, Jesus Coll.  
Thomas Henry Martin, Christ's Coll.  
Henry Finch, Christ's Coll.  
Henry Nussey, Magdalene Coll.  
Henry W. Beauford, Magdalene Coll.  
Philip Wynell Mayow, Trinity Coll.  
John Reynolds Goodman, Trinity Coll.  
James Ogilby, Trinity Coll.  
Frederick Lane Birch, St. John's Coll.  
William Oliver, St. Peter's Coll.  
Robert Josh. Almond, Catharine Hall.  
John Fendall Newton, Jesus Coll.  
William Comyns Berkeley, Jesus Coll.  
David Bruce, Jesus Coll.  
Charles Thomas J. Baines, Christ's Coll.  
John Todd, Christ's Coll.  
Henry Rowland Bramwell, Christ's Coll.  
Edw. Holmes Farrington, Magdalene Coll.

## CLASSICAL TRIPOS.—March 2, 1835.

## EXAMINERS.

Capel Loft, M.A., King's Coll.  
William Selwyn, M.A., St. John's Coll.  
Chris. Wordsworth, M.A., Trinity Coll.  
Joseph Wm. Blakesley, M.A., Trinity Coll.

## FIRST CLASS.

Goulburn,	Trin.	Grote,	Trin.
Howes,	Trin.	Cooper,	Trin.
Harris,	Trin.	Wilkinson,	Clare
Rawle,	Trin.	Cotterill,	Joh.
Merivale,	Trin.	Richards,	Joh.

## SECOND CLASS.

Beadon,	Joh.	Laing,	Joh.
Hue,	Trin.	Ramsey,	Pemb.
Scrivener,	Trin.	Legrew,	Joh.
Drake,	Joh.	Bishop,	Joh.
Seager,	Trin.	Pector,	Cath.
Meade,	Caius	Wackerbath,	Corpus

THIRD CLASS.			
Waltham,	Joh.	Barber,	Joh.
Stocks,	Trin.	Dixon,	Sidney
Ellison,	Trin.	Smith, A.	Joh
Leeffe,	Trin.	Howes,	Trin. H.
Tillard,	Joh.	White,	Joh.

## CAMBRIDGE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

March 2. *Professor Airy, F.P. in the Chair.*—Various presents of books and other objects were laid before the Society. A Memoir, by the Rev. R. Murphy, of Caius College, was read, containing the conclusion of his Researches on the *Inverse Calculus of Definite Integrals*; also a Memoir by R. Stevenson, Esq., of Trinity College, on the Solution of some Problems connected with the theory of Straight Lines and Planes, by a new and symmetrical method of co-ordinates. A communication was likewise made by W. Hopkins, Esq., on Physical Geology; in which he shewed, on mechanical principles, that forces of elevation, acting on extended masses of nearly horizontal strata, would necessarily produce a double system of fissures, one in the direction of the beds, the other at right angles to that direction. In a discussion which took place afterwards, Professor Sedgwick pointed out several districts which illustrated the truth of Mr. Hopkins' theory, viz. Flintshire, Derbyshire, the mining districts of Cumberland, &c.

March 16, *The Rev. Professor Clark, F.P. in the Chair.*—A paper was read by Mr. W. W. Fisher, of Downing College, illustrated by coloured drawings, on the nature, structure, and changes of Tuber-

cles: the conclusion at which the author arrived was, that tubercles are organized, or organizable products; that they consist in general in an alteration of the structure of the organ in which they occur; and that the changes which they undergo are essentially due to inherent vital actions, the process of softening being frequently marked by the development of a new order of vessels in the diseased structure. Afterwards, Mr. Willis gave an account of his views respecting the progress of Gothic architecture, especially with reference to the formation of *tracery*. He noticed that *Romanesque* architecture differed from classical in the employment of *compound* arches, (instead of *architraves*) several arches being placed under each other, so as to form successive *orders* of openings. As a next step, the sides of these arches are decorated with shafts; but these are different in the north and south of Europe. In the former (as in Norman architecture) the shafts replace the edges of the openings, and are called *edge shafts*; in Italian *Romanesque* the shafts are placed in the square recesses of the sides of the openings, and are *nook shafts*. When the successive orders of openings became of different forms, (as two arches under one, or trefoils under simple arches) there is an approximation to *tracery*; and when the mouldings which bound the openings form bars, we have *tracery*. Hence the mullions and bars have mouldings which follow a series of subordination corresponding to the orders of openings, and this subordination is clearly exhibited to the very latest period of good Gothic architecture.

## NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The observations of "An Old Subscriber" shall be attended to.

Many thanks to "R. B. B." his request shall be attended to.

We have no idea how it happened that "The Advertisements" never appeared.

We have received all the Hymns alluded to by "E. C. K." and beg to thank him for his willing concurrence.

Our "Volume of Music" will be somewhat broader and longer than our 8vo. Edition of Psalms and Hymns, which will therefore preclude the possibility of their being bound together.

As far as the Observations of "X." apply to *rejoicing* he may be correct; but would he object to a *supplicatory* Psalm or Hymn?

We could wish that "W. J. B." always wrote with a steel pen.

In reply to "One of that Body"—we ask, where are they forbidden? and refer him for further information to Bishop Heber's Letters to the present Archbishop of Canterbury (when Bishop of London), to the Preface to a Selection of Hymns published at York, to the end of his own Prayer Book, and to the universal and imperative demand.

We are unwillingly compelled to defer our "Law Report," with many other articles of information.

"J. R." lays us under many obligations for the tunes with which he has favoured us; and we hope our other friends will not forget us. The more simple the airs the better.

We should be obliged if "Carivius" would favour us with his address, as we may wish to communicate with him.

We shall be indebted to "T. W." for his proffered Tunes as soon as convenient.